

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME VII
NUMBER 10

DECEMBER, 1899

WHOLE
NUMBER 70

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

THE fourteenth annual meeting of the association was held in the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on Friday, October 13, 1899, with President Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University, in the chair. The attendance was large and representative of all the New England States.

THE PRESIDENT: The subject for our discussion this afternoon is the Advisable Differences between the Education of Young Women and that of Young Men. President Goucher, of the Woman's College of Baltimore, will open this discussion.

THE ADVISABLE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG WOMEN AND THAT OF YOUNG MEN

By PRESIDENT JOHN FRANKLIN GOUCHER
Of the Woman's College of Baltimore

Ideals and opportunity are two essentials of success. In the absence of ideals effort would be without an intelligible goal and achievement would have no proper gauge. An ideal clearly perceived in conditions which make its approximation impossible would be tantalizing if not revulsive. The discussion of "the advisable differences between the education of young women and young men" cannot ignore these two essentials. It should

be based upon clear perceptions of the ideals to be sought, the distinguishing characteristics of those to be educated, and the object and nature of education.

The terms young women and young men exclude infants and children, as well as persons of maturer years, and include young people who are from sixteen or seventeen to twenty-one or twenty-two years of age. This rules out of the discussion primary and secondary education, also graduate and technical education, and limits our consideration to college education.

Graduate and technical education appeal to the student largely as an instrument. College education addresses the student as a person. The object of college education is not to make a living, but to make a life. It is the unfolding, by instruction and training, of the whole nature towards its highest possibilities. It is something else and something more than the mastering of languages and sciences, important as these are as agencies and accessories. It has to do with the mental, physical, esthetic and spiritual natures; it aims at the healthful development of each and the proper correlation of all attributes and functions of the complex nature into a symmetrical personality. It includes everything which enters into or influences the formation of character and aids the individual to the mastery of himself at his best.

If the terms young women and young men are synonymous and are not used to designate and in a measure describe persons or classes of different characteristics, there is no need for a discussion, for if the two classes are identical in nature, functions and ideal, their education should be identical.

But if the nature has a purposeful relation to the ideal and both nature and ideal in one class differ essentially from the nature and ideal of the other class, their functions cannot be identical, competitive or substitutional to more than a limited extent, and the education should be so adjusted to the nature and ideal of each, that its functions will not be impaired but strengthened.

There are physical and psychical differences between young women and young men. These are inherent, indicative of the

sexes and determine the functions to which each is adapted. These inherent differences are in process of development and establishment between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one. Their establishment makes considerable, and in many cases, severe drafts upon the system. In one class this process is much more protracted and exacting than in the other, but its exactions may not be disregarded without great peril, for their proper establishment and maintenance is of prime importance to health and efficiency. An attempt to ignore them would contradict the historic and scientific necessities of the development of the race.

Scientifically: Development always emphasizes peculiarities and registers itself in individualization. In the lower orders of life exchange of functions is not impossible, but as they advance distinctions which were rudimentary and scarcely discernible become pronounced, determining appearance, character and use. Interference with or suppression of these characteristics is not progress, but degeneration.

Historically: In the lower stages of civilization woman had to do nearly every form of work. She was mother, teacher, agriculturist, purveyor, manufacturer, merchant, banker and general drudge. Man occupied himself with such employments as were incidental to aggressive or defensive warfare. Civilization has developed increased efficiency and realized excellence by specializing the work of each. Civilization and interdependence develop side by side. As we rise in the scale of civilization the demands upon woman concentrate more and more, yet maintain as great variety within their narrower limits, while the demands upon man are multiplied, but simplified by processes of specialization. The suggestions of the earlier condition are the characteristics of the later. Woman's special work is still centered in the home and circles outward, while man's special work is outside the home and circles inward, each essential to and supplementing the other.

Man's success is through concentration, continuity of work, and cumulative results. He must be a specialist, limiting his field if he would intensify his power. His strength is in

persistence. The diffused man is pilloried as "jack of all trades, master of none."

The highest function of womanhood is motherhood. Her whole organization is adjusted to the accomplishment of this. She is of a more intense nature, has keener insight and stronger passions, is more conscientious in details and less skillful in generalization than man. The laws written in her nature require her to stand nearest childhood, and make her the determining factor in the moral, esthetic, and social atmosphere of the home, which is the embryo and exponent of society and civilization. Her work becomes more difficult and further reaching as it becomes more closely related to those subtle forces which determine destiny. The hope of the race is in the success with which she does this work. The demands upon her are varied, involved and numberless, and her success will depend upon her versatility. She needs alertness and equipoise, judgment and skill, taste and tact, a nature enriched with varied and exact knowledge, beautified by culture, chaste and strong through discipline, lofty in ideal, and possessing the incomparable grace of unselfish ministry. Thus and thus only, as wife, mother, embodiment, and inspiration of the best in society, an ever new revelation of the meaning, beauty, and power of the gospel of love and ministry is she qualified to meet the varied demands of family life.

The family, and not the individual, is the unit factor of the Christian civilization. The ideals for womanhood and manhood are not independent and substitutional, but supplemental. The woman is to be "an helpmeet for man" at his best. They are not superior and inferior, for either without the other is incomplete. Neither has a sphere, for each is but a hemisphere, "and they shall be one." The attempt of either to live in any other way is sure to be not concentric as to purpose, but eccentric. Some males and some females, from choice or circumstances, are, and possibly always will be, nonadjusted—like the person who wished she had been born a widow with two children—but they fall short of the ideal, and must be considered and provided for as exceptions. The ideal womanhood and manhood are to be found in the family, for this is the unalterable provision for the

continuance of the race, and education, whatever else it does or does not, should not fail to prepare the two diverse but supplemental personalities for this dual unity.

The education of people as people is quite a modern thing. For centuries there have been here and there examples of the influence of educated women, but the higher education of woman as a class is of recent effort. The problem is still in its experimental stage and cannot be settled offhand. The need for and ability of women to take college education is demonstrated by their record and conceded by the intelligent, but its scope, the methods by which, and the conditions within which, the most desirable results can be realized are still open questions.

Coeducation, whatever that is, has not satisfied the requirements. The term is indefinitely used to designate variables which it does not describe. There is no institution where the sexes are educated alike. Restrictions are always placed upon the young women, which are not solely determined by age, standing, or purpose, but by their sex. In some of these institutions the young women and young men are required to use the gymnasium at different hours and given different exercises. In others the young women are practically excluded from its use, and in all they are excluded from the baseball, football, lacrosse, and boating teams, and denied the systematic training given these. The hours, places, and special conditions for intercourse with young men are regulated; the methods and frequently the content of instruction are varied. Differences are always recognized, and must be for prudential reasons and to meet the demands of society, for there is a deep-seated and general conviction, prejudice, opinion, or judgment—call it what you please—that there are radical differences between the two sexes.

In every well regulated family there is a marked difference between the treatment of the boys and girls. The one-roomed cabin in the South and West is an evil of the same kind as the crowded tenement house in the city, for each makes more difficult that individualization of the sexes which is for the best interests of both. When the problem, confessedly difficult in the family, is further complicated by multiplying each unit by one

or two hundred, dividing the direction among a diverse faculty, at a time when the sexual distinctions are in the crisis of their development, the work limited to three or four years, and these years included in those when the assertiveness of youth is at its maximum, and willingness for routine at its minimum, it is manifestly important that classification and individualization be applied as far as possible, in order that means and ends may have the best approximate relation to each other.

The attempt to educate young women and young men as one usually assumes that one to be the young man, and the adjustments of the work are generally made with reference to maintaining the standards just like institutions whose sole purpose it is to prepare young men for the demands of commercial, civil or professional life.

Young women as a rule are not aided in their best work as students by the presence of young men. The results are variable. With some it is dissipating, with others it produces an undesirable reserve, and with others an unhealthy tension and nervous strain.

The high grade, thoroughly equipped colleges for women, established at great expense during the past two or three decades, have more applicants knocking at their doors than they can accommodate. This is a demonstration of dissatisfaction with the coeducational experiment. This dissatisfaction is greater than it seems. According to the last report of the Commissioner of Education, 1896-7, there were 429 young women pursuing college education in the United States for every million of the population. Of these 223, or 52 per cent., were in coeducational colleges and universities, and 206, or 48 per cent., in the separate colleges for women. To appreciate this fact we must remember—in the not remote past, the only opportunity for women to secure a thorough college education was in the coeducational institutions.

The large number of coeducational institutions proposing to do college work—there are 335 of them scattered all over the country—afford proximity, home residence, parental guidance, and comparative inexpensiveness to many who would not

go away from home to a coeducational institution. The colleges for women are less numerous, more remote from their clientele, and without state aid, yet the students in the colleges for women constitute 48 per cent. of the entire number of young women seeking college education.

Cash outlay is in many cases the determining factor in attendance upon a coeducational institution. The colleges and universities receiving federal and state aid are able to offer inexpensive, and, in many cases, free tuition, and they number among their students of college grade 5533 young women, or 35 per cent. of all who are attending coeducational institutions.

Of the 15,652 women in the coeducational institutions of the United States seeking college education, 11,453 or 73+ per cent. are in the institutions north of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi rivers. This includes all the new states and territories, where the pioneers have been so busy laying foundations and developing resources that they have made but little and in some states no provision, other than coeducational for the college training of women.

Of the young women who in 1896-7 were doing college work in the coeducational institutions, only one in 21+ received the degree of A.B., while in the colleges for women one in 14+ attained to that degree. Great is love and propinquity is her high priest, and it would be interesting if we had the facts at command to determine how far marriage before graduation accounts for these striking figures, but we are safe in saying, leisure and concentration are conditions of culture. When concentration is necessary the object sought should determine the things to be eliminated and freedom from obtrusive opportunities for social intercourse in part accounts for the excellent showing of the colleges for women.

The college education of women has entered upon the fourth stage of the experiment.

The *first* was the pseudo-college training, in the so-called "female colleges." The name was a concession to the times. The schools served a purpose and marked an important advance, but gave way to the larger requirements of the problem.

The *second* was coeducation, or the attempt of young women to get their education in colleges for men. It has made for itself a record and will continue to have a clientage among those who live contiguous, or believe competition with the opposite sex to be helpful, or would improve their opportunities for early marriage, or think the differences between young women and young men are not of such character as to be considered in education, or let the cash outlay required determine their selection.

The colleges for women, which already contain 48 per cent. of the young women seeking college education, have been engaged in the *third* stage of the experiment, namely, the attempt to give in separate institutions education identical, in matter and method, with that provided for men, or the attempt to use man-making methods for woman-making purposes.

The longings of woman for culture, her intense desire for the opportunities which man possessed, the fact that she was prejudged unequal to such severe and comprehensive work, and the further fact that men had set the standards of excellence, made her unwilling to accept anything less or anything else than that which was found in the colleges for men, and all the best colleges for women modeled their courses, instruction and administration after their standards.

But what is identical education? Is it to be identical with the age when only Greek and mathematics were required, or is it to be identical with the college of a few years ago, when the curriculum was inflexible and cut up into four years of required work with no opportunity for electives or even alternatives, or which of the great schools of today shall be selected as the model, and who shall define it in exact terms, or if it is so defined, who can guarantee the definition will describe the provisions, limitations and requirements twelve months hence, or if it can be defined, imitated and administered to women, is it to be supposed or desired that the results will be identical with those realized with men?

The present effort in the colleges for men is not to bring every young man, whatever his talent or purpose, to the same

standard by the use of an inflexible method, but after considering his peculiarities, aptitudes and purpose, to determine the preparation most desirable for each particular man, and then assign such subjects and such methods of studying them as will best aid him to his purpose. If this is desirable for young men, it is equally so for young women, and absolutely necessary as between two classes possessing inherently different characteristics, functions and ideals.

This is being recognized among the colleges for women and to a greater or less degree they have entered upon the *fourth* stage of the experiment, *viz.*, to educate young women as women. As the experiment has not been carried to a demonstration, no one is prepared to speak the final word upon the subject.

The topic assigned me, "the advisable differences between the education of young women and young men," proposes a comparison between the best methods of educating these two classes of college students. As those who are specially engaged in the education of young men are still experimenting, observing and discussing and are not agreed among themselves in particulars which each considers important, as to specific aims, limits and methods, and as the higher education of woman is working towards conclusions, but has not passed its experimental stage, may I be excused from attempting the impossible task of comparing two undetermined methods and be permitted to make a few suggestions concerning some conditions which I think very desirable for the college education of young women? Then, any who care to may compare his ideal of the education of young men with these suggestions and draw his own conclusions as to desirable differences.

As college education includes everything, within the years of its application, which enters into or influences the formation of character, and aids the individual to the mastery of herself at her best, it will include instruction, administration and equipment, and I will speak of:

1. The equipment: The location should be in a representative city, with athletic grounds easily accessible, not in the business center nor in an obscure suburb, but in the best residential

section. Young women should not be disarticulated from society. But while they are students they should be relieved from its obtrusive solicitations and onerous demands. Such a location may be relatively somewhat expensive, but the question is not the cheapest place but the best. The city will be as healthful as any other place and more broadening, and the students will be less liable to fads and absurdities of conduct which sometimes attend large companies of young people when isolated. It makes possible the attendance of specialists, secures visits from men and women distinguished in science, literature, arts and politics, who, by their presence and the force of their personality, are helpful factors in thorough culture. Works of art, the best music, large libraries, valuable collections illustrative of natural history and the manufacturing arts, are accessible to an extent impossible in a rural or less central location, while economic, benevolent and religious organizations afford invaluable opportunities for observation and study.

The buildings should be well differentiated, not too large and not more than three stories high, two might be better; the stairs should be easy and if a building is three or more stories high there should be elevators in constant use for those who may desire them. Each building should be particularly adapted to the department or work it is to house. The furnishing of the laboratories, libraries, museums and gymnasium should be ample and easily accessible and the working sections should contain as many duplicates as will enable the students to study and familiarize themselves with the books and specimens out of class hours.

The halls of residence should be separate from the laboratories, instruction halls and from each other, but conveniently near. They should not have more than two and better but one in a room, and provide accommodations for from fifty to sixty students each, not too few lest it encroach upon independence and interfere with the ease of general intercourse, and not too many lest it fail to secure carefully guarded rest. Healthful development is impossible unless repair exceeds expenditure and rest is as imperative as activity.

The buildings should be constructed with the greatest care as to light and heat, ventilation and sanitation, convenience and artistic effect in arrangement and outlines, coloring and detail. Everything should be characterized by simplicity, utility and harmony of relations. It is important that young women who are to be the home-makers shall spend the three or four impressionable years of their college life in an esthetic atmosphere which shall develop and satisfy the most refined taste. The faculty should be about equally divided between men and women, chosen because of their strong, helpful personality, aptness to teach and scholarship. Manliness and womanliness should be as jealously insisted upon as aptness to teach and scholarship, for efficiency will be determined by the average of the three, rather than by the excess of any one of these.

2. The administration: It should be a college for women. It should not permit the mingling of two distinct classes of students, neither young women and young men, nor college preparatory and college students, nor college students and graduate students. The college education of young women should be separated from all these complications, in order to realize the best results.

The number of students in a college for women should not be too large, about four hundred should be the maximum, and the classes should be handled in sections relatively small. When the patronage is largely local, the results are in danger of being provincial. The attendance should be large enough to permit of careful classification, great variety of studies and representatives from the different sections of the country, but small enough that the professors and instructors may know all the students in their classes personally, understand their peculiarities of taste and aptitudes and counsel them wisely as to their plans and work. Fullness of opportunity is to be desired, and a well defined ideal is necessary, but young women are not likely to attain to the best of either when the restraints of home have been removed without wise counsel and intelligent guidance by those who personally know and sympathize with them. Nothing can serve as a substitute for this friendly,

personal intercourse and confidence between teachers and students.

It is undesirable for teachers to reside in the residence halls with the students. They will have more and a better influence if they come to the halls of instruction with the force of a fresh relation and occasionally entertain their students, a few at a time, in their homes.

If the development is to be normal and result in a strong self-reliant personality, the control must come from within and work outward; it must not be by espionage and repression but by an acceptance of recognized ideals and honorable self-direction. The regulations should be few as may be, to remind the thoughtless, instruct the ignorant and protect the wise. As the college is not a reformatory, the vicious and willful should not be permitted.

The work of young women, as to method, should be wrought within conditions less rigid than may be proper for men, more liberty should be given for the larger play of individual conditions which with them are more variable.

The truest womanliness is not attained by the persistent dig. Provision should be made for regulated social functions. Dinner should be a leisurely and somewhat formal meal. Receptions should be provided for at irregular intervals, and calls from young men permitted within proper limits. Large liberty within the proprieties of refined society should be permitted. Literary, scientific, benevolent, Christian and social organizations, within the student body, should be encouraged, but the students should be counseled to exercise choice and limit the number to which they belong. The helpful influence of a few such associations should not be destroyed by the dissipation of membership in many. Such are the conditions of society that young men can readily satisfy the requirements of their social nature. Opportunities are more necessary and less accessible to young women away from their homes, and should not be overlooked, for woman's power to bless is increased by her ease and grace in the various relations in which she finds herself.

From inclination, or training, or because social standards

restrain, young women are more sedentary than young men, their pursuits when not at study tend more to withdraw them from exercise than to invite them to it, and provision should be made for adjusted, systematic and required exercise under the personal direction of skilled medical advisors and specialists in mechanico-therapeutics, for a disciplined body is as essential to a thoroughly educated woman as a cultured mind or a loyal spirit.

The higher education must include the education of the higher nature. A representative college in a Christian land should have a faculty and an atmosphere thoroughly Christian. Thorough culture is always reverent. All will agree that whatever may be their positions in life young women should have healthy bodies, cultured minds and Christian characters. As there are requirements leading to the intellectual and physical training, so there should be provision for the spiritual nature, including systematic study of the Bible, and attendance upon chapel and church services. The city location makes it possible for each student to continue her relation with a church and pastor in the denomination with which she was associated at her home, which is greatly to be preferred to the abnormal arrangement of a college church.

3. The instruction: There are three normal relations of woman to society, and every woman may be called upon to occupy any one of these or all of them in turn, and possibly all of them at once. The young man can choose his vocation, prepare for and work towards it, and wisely or unwisely, the tendency in colleges for men is in the direction of more and earlier specialization to hasten and intensify his preparation. The college education of women must recognize and be adjusted to the fact that it is impossible to determine beforehand in which of three relations she will find her chief opportunity. Her college work will be wisely done if, so far as may be, it qualifies her for efficiency in them all. Unless invalidated physically, mentally or morally, and so properly included among the dependent classes which are necessarily consumers, she will be called upon to add to the sum total of well-being by living her life in one or more of three relations.

(a) She may be adjusted according to the highest and holiest functions of her nature, as wife and mother, in the heart of her home. In this organized relation of wedded oneness with the man of her love, she will be at her best, sharing responsibility and multiplying influence.

(b) She may be non-adjusted, and as a bread-earner required to work at a disadvantage and with lower aims, as does the non-adjusted male, but work is honorable in all, inseparable from life, and should be to the last degree efficient. For reasons inherent in her sex, as already intimated and to some extent from social prejudice, all occupations will not afford her equal opportunities for success in bread-earning. Efficiency is found along lines of supply and demand, ability and opportunity, and the college education of young women should have regard to her possible relation to these conditions.

(c) Every community should have a leisure class, not composed of persons who have nothing to do, but of those who will command time for educational, benevolent and religious offices, working wisely for the general good without direct financial return. This class, composed largely of women, should be cultured, so as to be efficient through fitness, their thought controlling and their feelings humanizing their activities.

To meet these changeable relations and the varying demands which await every woman, she needs versatility, and her college education especially should aim at culture in its broader sense, rather than to prepare her as a specialist for a profession or a trade. Culture does not consist in the things one knows, but in the ability to appreciate conditions and relations and to secure desirable results. Its object is not to produce an encyclopedia nor an instrument, but a forceful and resourceful personality. This will require discipline and acquirements.

The discipline should not be narrow; but should aim at training every element of the complex nature. The physical to endurance and graceful obedience to the will; the mental to accuracy, agility, persistence, keenness of observation, clearness of perception and discriminative expression; and the moral to truth, justice, forbearance, self-restraint, a high sense of honor

and reverence. That is, the objective of culture is the mastery of the entire self, well furnished and at its best.

In securing the discipline and development of the personality, it is wise to carry on the processes of education, so far as may be, by the use of such studies and exercises as will enlarge the acquirements at the same time they discipline the faculties. Instruction should be constructive, furnishing materials and tools as well as developing skill in the use of those already possessed. In order to this it should be thorough, comprehensive and exact in results, including a liberal range of subjects.

A number of these should be required of all students, some for purposes of drill, others for general information in the fundamentals of knowledge, or for acquaintance with principles. In a general way, leaving room for exceptions, these should include chemistry and physics, hygiene and physiology, studied by laboratory methods, with as practical bearing upon domestic science as may be without sacrificing thoroughness and comprehensiveness, some branch of natural history with as much field work as practicable, history and sociology, economics and charities, art criticism, philosophy and ethics and the Bible —our greatest classic, as containing the basis of social and personal ethics. These should be so taught as to realize enrichment and facility of discrimination in the relations of life. English should be so taught as to secure an acquaintance with, appreciation of and facility in using good English, and every student should have at graduation a good reading knowledge of German and French. All language work should include the literary and stylistic study of the authors and the epoch and people as revealed through their literature. The study of a minor course in these various subjects will aid the student to discover herself, her tastes and aptitudes, furnish her with horizon and some perspective, and a considerable fund of information. It will occupy little more than one half of the sixty hours in her college course. I have not included mathematics in the required work, for this subject has been studied for six or seven years before entering college.

It should be possible to pursue a minor, a major and one or two post-majors in any principal subject. The pursuit of two or three majors is very desirable. In no course offered, except in the post-major courses, should emphasis be placed upon the technic so much as upon the culture of the mind, the senses, the appreciation, the personality.

Every student should be required to continue the study of one principal subject, or a subject and its cognate subjects, through the four years of her college work. A careful, persistent, detailed, and comprehensive study of one leading subject through three or four years gives discipline and accuracy, mental grasp and taste, lays foundations and secures a facility of application which will serve in any or all of her normal relations, in the home, in bread-earning, or in the ministries of the leisure class. Its further pursuit in later life may become an avocation and the discipline and acquisitions derived from it will give increased efficiency and pleasure whatever may be her relations. If need arise it may determine her vocation, and her graduate work may add to it, or larger success in some other line may be possible because of it.

Inadequate as these suggestions are to even outline a part of the subject assigned me, I make them, confident that the need is so urgent, the distinctions are so radical and inherent, the effort is so persistent, and failure would be so disastrous, that the end sought will sooner or later, along these or other lines not widely divergent from them, determine the scope, the means, and the conditions by which thorough womanliness can be best developed and realize its enthronement in the heart and home of humanity.

DISCUSSION

MRS. ALICE FREEMAN PALMER: Mr. President—After hearing so much of women's education I hoped men's colleges would be represented next. Perhaps, however, I may begin the general discussion while the younger members of the association are deciding what to say on the complicated subject of the afternoon; for there is probably no one else in the room who has had so many years of experience—who is so ancient a pioneer in the college education of women—as I. For

it is now nearly a quarter of a century ago that I graduated from college—a college not at all like Dr. Goucher's ideal—but a western university with hundreds of young men, and a handful of timid girls, only then questioningly admitted. Since that time I have been constantly associated with college students, and I have chanced to know many thousands of college women, in the East and in the West, a part of them—and a large part—trained in coeducational colleges; many of them trained in women's colleges—but colleges very unlike Dr. Goucher's description. Now, for a dozen years, under the Cambridge elms, I have watched the still more recent type of woman's college which Dean Irwin represents, and which she is helping to fashion. So I want to say one reassuring word out of this varied experience East and West, and in all possible kinds of colleges, and I am increasingly thankful that there are so many kinds for our many kinds of girls in the widely varying conditions of the country. My word is this: that it is not possible today, any more than it was possible a hundred years ago, to annihilate the womanliness of our American girls by anything that you can do to them in education (laughter). I really cannot find that it makes much difference in their love of womanly ideals whether they are in a western coeducational college, or under the shadow of the oldest eastern university, or alone in the estates of a woman's college by themselves. I have found everywhere womanly girls, keen in their ambitions for usefulness, and tender-hearted in their desire to be good comrades of the American men, with whom they expect to live their lives.

May I venture to say that we have made quite too much of the first syllable in the word, coeducation. We are emphasising it more than it will bear. It is well to discuss ideals. We are hearing a great deal just now about "the ideal college course for women." But I always want to ask, "whose ideal?" and "for which college women?"

Twenty-five years ago we were all sure—I was sure—that when women began in large numbers to go to college, and were free to choose, they would turn mainly to languages and literature; to history fine arts, music; the esthetic side of life. I thought of their sympathy, their imagination, their affection, and I expected they would excel in the humanities. I never foresaw that they would turn impasioned to pure mathematics, to physics, chemistry, biology, astronomy. Yet that is the evidence of twenty-five years. New England, as well as old England, has her Phillippa Fawcetts, and women in Europe, as well as in this country, in the few years they have had a little freedom

of opportunity, have shown such particular aptitude for mathematics, and the exact sciences, that I am sometimes afraid they are going to leave all the poetry and philosophy to men, and claim the accurate sciences for themselves.

We old teachers know that girls differ among themselves in mental tastes and powers, quite as much as they differ from boys. My experience in teaching both makes me confident that whatever our own individual ideals may be, the only way to show what is the ideal college, or to find out the advisable college studies for women, is to give the widest possible freedom in election of subjects and methods to our daughters, to let the girls who are fed by mathematics have mathematics, and the girls who long for music and art have music and art as their specialties; and, to be sure, all the time, that we shall "fit them to be good wives and mothers" when we fit them to be fine and cultivated women.

But I cannot sit down without saying again that it does disappoint me to find the whole discussion centering upon the women, and utterly neglecting the men. After all, men have their rights, as Dr. Gallagher has suggested. I, for my part, like to hope that our American boys in the colleges are being trained to be good fathers (applause), that they are being trained to be gentlemen. We want good manners in America very badly, indeed, and we who have the women's colleges in charge cannot take the whole blame for the grievous lack. We want beauty in this country, we are starving for it, in public and in private, on the streets and in our homes; and we cannot leave to our women's colleges all the esthetic training of the community.

Certainly, while I listened to Dr. Goucher's admirable description of what the fruits of education should be, I was applying it to Harvard and Yale and Amherst, and the other colleges of this association. Hardly one of his wished-for results but the young men need, quite as much as the young women. We, here, want to find the best ways of giving them also love of beauty, high ideals of fatherhood, and the desire to make noble homes, as well as just scientific and political training. We have not found these ways yet, and I hope this discussion will throw light on the problems which the young men also have a right to have considered (applause).

MR. WILLIAM C. COLLAR, of the Roxbury Latin School: When, a few moments ago, Mrs. Palmer asked me why in the world men did not speak, I said I supposed it must be because you ladies speak so admir-

ably that every man is afraid to rise. For my own part, I should very much rather listen to the ladies than to take any part myself. I had no thought of engaging in the discussion, and I shall occupy but a minute; I rise solely because I was afraid that what to me was the most important aspect of this question was in danger of not being so much as referred to. To me there is a difference, a desirable difference, between the education of men and women, that outweighs all other considerations that have been or can be adduced. But before I say what it is I want to make a remark in self-defense. I happen to have spoken briefly twice at the gatherings of ladies on the subject of the education of women, and my remarks were received with great disfavor; and I want to say, therefore, at the outset, that I should be extremely sorry to be taken again as an opponent of the higher education of women. I do not believe there is anybody who believes more heartily in the higher education of women than I do, or who rejoices more at the prospect of what it is likely to do for women and for the race. Notwithstanding that, when I have been asked by mothers, as I have been frequently, about the education of their daughters, whether I would advise that they should go to college or not, I have hesitated very much about advising that they should. And why? Now comes the point that I wanted to speak of. Because I thought that the colleges where women are educated not only permit but encourage, and not only encourage but demand, an amount of work that I consider dangerous to the health of women. So long as that is true I shall hesitate when my advice is asked about recommending girls to go to college. Mark what I say of what I esteem the great benefits that are to be derived, and they are so great that I believe it is better to run occasionally the risk of a girl's breaking down than for her not to have the advantages of college education. I have had one daughter educated at two New England colleges, and she was naturally a good scholar and quick, and she had a good preparation; and yet during two years of her college life I was in a state of constant anxiety, and sometimes of alarm. What I mean to say is this: I think it is demonstrated clearly enough, as clearly as anything has been demonstrated, that women are as able in things intellectual as men. Their powers of acquisition, I think, are quite equal to those of men. I believe they are much quicker than men. But I believe that it remains to be proved that women can in a given time undergo the strain that men can undergo with safety, with safety to their health and the retention of their beauty. Mrs. Palmer says we want beauty in

America, and we do (laughter), and the more of it the better. We cannot have beauty enough. It is painful to me, from somewhat slight observation, to see what inroads college education for girls as it is pursued now makes upon their beauty (laughter and applause). I fear few girls can take the college courses as they are organized now and retain their health and beauty and bloom, and I say this is of infinitely greater consequence than that they should be profound in metaphysics or in the calculus. The difference then that I want to see, ladies and gentlemen, in one word, for I have spoken longer than I intended to, is this: I want to see a great reduction in the demands of the colleges on girls who are educated there. I want to see the colleges so organized that a parent can send his daughter, who has perhaps only mediocre talents, and is able to go at a mediocre pace, with a feeling of safety that she will come out of the college at least as well as she went in, and not with health imperiled and her beauty gone (applause).

PROFESSOR WILLIAM T. SEDGWICK, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Mr. President—I am a biologist and I have been now for many years teaching classes composed sometimes largely of men, with a few women; sometimes largely of women, with a few men; sometimes exclusively of women; and sometimes exclusively of men. I believe, both as a physiologist and as a teacher, that there are advisable differences in the college education of young women and young men, and I believe it, first, because of the physical differences between those persons. Younger than twelve or fifteen years I believe that they may well be taught together. In graduate schools I believe they may well be taught together. In the first case, because they are so much alike, and in the second case—I mean in the graduate departments—because the work is so largely individual. But I believe that in the intervening, or "college," grade they may much better be taught apart, not because there are intellectual differences which can be fixed upon and classified, not because I would for one moment restrict the opportunity of young women, but simply because they are young women on the one hand and young men on the other, and there are physiological differences which make it unwise to treat them identically or together, and which neither the teacher nor the pupil can neglect. I believe that the reason why coeducation is apparently so great a success in the West is because in many cases the tests applied are not severe. I believe that the intellectual work required is not so exacting as to make it necessary for either young

men or young women to work constantly and severely, I mean, with great severity. Wherever I have seen the necessity for that kind of work I have found that by the end of the year the young women were giving out. Any physiologist and anyone who will not blink the question knows very well why. Sex makes a greater demand upon young women than upon young men, and in my judgment, it is idle to neglect this fact ; I, certainly, cannot neglect it for I have seen its results. I have seen the results of severe intellectual labor in class room and in laboratory upon young men and young women working side by side, and it is for that reason that I agree most heartily with the principal speaker of the afternoon. I believe that the young woman's college has come to stay. I believe that it is one of the best things that has ever been introduced into American education, and I believe it is a natural thing. I do not believe in coeducation in the college grade. And I could not forbear, Mr. President, to rise and express my great satisfaction with the principal paper of the afternoon. It seems to me that in simplicity of statement, in sanity of judgment, in frank recognition of the actual differences which exist between young men and young women, and a readiness to accept the consequences of these differences, the speaker has done us great service. But in order that I may not be misunderstood I wish to repeat what I have already said and what I most deeply believe, that the fullest and the freest and the most costly and the highest education should be thrown open to young women. I am constantly inviting them into my own laboratories ; I have had many of the teachers—the women teachers—of Boston there, and I appeal to any of them to defend me from the charge of prejudice against women or women's education ; but, on the other hand, I cannot neglect the physical and the physiological facts ; I cannot neglect the results of experience.

PRESIDENT CHARLES W. ELIOT : It seems to the Chairman of the meeting that the discussion has lately drifted somewhat away from the subject which was assigned for this afternoon. Have we not been discussing lately the relative advantages of different modes of educating young women ? The real question before us is the advisable differences between the education of young women and that of young men. I will take the liberty of contributing a few words to the discussion of that particular question (applause).

I was struck by the definition which Dr. Gallagher gave of good education—self-realization ; that is, the achievement of one's best in

the course of this human life. Self-realization! Now, are the selves the same in men and women? That seems to me to be a fundamental question. Whether these selves which are to be as perfectly realized as possible in this life are the same in the two sexes. Mrs. Palmer said with great truth that it was impossible to extinguish or annihilate womanliness, no matter to what training exercises you may subject the woman. What is that womanliness which is so indestructible! What is the manliness which is equally indestructible? Are they alike? Are they not essentially different, and do we not all recognize that essential difference; and is not the charm of human life and the greatest happiness of life due to that essential difference? Then it seems to me that function should ultimately determine education. If we know what the function of a human being is to be, have we not in that knowledge a good guide to the education of the individual? Now, is there not a profound and eternal difference between the function of the woman and the function of the man in this world? Look at them physically between the ages of 25 and 45. How profoundly different are the functions of the woman and the man? We must consider masses in discussing this question, not individuals. Look at the great mass, and is not the function of the woman between 25 and 45 deeply different from that of the man? I say that education should regard function. Therefore, must it not be that the right education of a woman, or of women in general, should be different from the right education of men in general? And, again, should not education be determined by environment? It has been determined by environment for the millions of the human race. How must it be in the future? Does not environment determine education, and should not education prepare for environment? Now, how different is the environment through life of every woman from that of every man? Are we not all sensible of this profound and eternal difference in environment? Therefore, must we not all think it probable that there should be a difference in education corresponding to that difference, that inevitable difference, of environment?

These considerations suggest to my mind that there must be a real, essential, wise difference between the education of a young woman and that of a young man; but who pretends that we have found out what it shall be? That is the interesting part of the whole matter. We have yet to find it out. We have yet to demonstrate it. As I have listened this afternoon, I think I have perceived a unanimity of opinion as to the means of finding out the answer to this great problem.

We seem all to agree that the means of discovery is to be an absolute freedom of election of studies for both men and women (laughter and applause). That is a delightful conclusion for a Harvard man (laughter).

EVENING SESSION.

The association reassembled at 7:30 P.M.

THE PRESIDENT: I have the honor of presenting to the members of the association Professor Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University.

SPURIOUS VERSUS REAL PATRIOTISM IN EDUCATION.

By PROFESSOR WOODROW WILSON,
of Princeton University.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The subject which has been assigned to me is Spurious as contrasted with Real Patriotism in Education. Why should a man speak this evening on patriotism by way of exhortation? Is not this immediate part of the land, at any rate, full of the voices of patriotic feeling? Are we not now worshiping at the feet of a man whom we conceive to represent the power and the dignity of the nation, a man of moderation and self-possession in peace, as well as of mastery and bravery in war? And is it not true that our hearts, no matter what our opinions may be with regard to questions of policy, are at unison in rejoicing that we can produce such men? It would seem a work of impertinence to speak to a country, or to any persons connected with a country, thus stirred to tell them how they ought to feel with respect to matters of patriotism.

And yet I think you will agree with me, after very little reflection, that patriotism is, after all, not essentially a sentiment. Patriotism expresses itself in sentiment, but it does not consist of sentiment. Patriotism is a principle, not a sentiment. It is a principle of devotion, and I cannot conceive of any principle of devotion which is not suitable to the object to which we are devoted. Shall I say that I am devoted to my friend and then shall I do my friend a dis-service? Shall I praise in him what I do not honestly admire? Shall I leave unpraised what I

think for his good? Shall I agree with him out of mere complaisance, and shall I show my friendship by such agreement? Surely that is not the principle of devotion. Devotion suits itself to its object and is careful to serve the thing served according to its character. And so I say that, although this principle of devotion breeds sentiment, it is a schooled and chastened sentiment. It is a sentiment which expresses itself in the wise and moderate counsels of real and thoughtful friendship.

If I were to undertake to describe what patriotism is, I should say that it is not a thing singular and apart, it is not a thing which we can separate from other like sentiments. When we speak of the character of a man as being unselfish, we have begun to describe him by the same terms that we would use in describing him as a patriot, for I take it that patriotism is grounded in what unselfishness is grounded in, namely, a certain energy of character expressing itself outside of the narrow circle of self-interest. We are not so small as to live only for ourselves. That is what we say to the world when we prove ourselves true friends; and when we prove ourselves true patriots we are but extending the circle of this principle of friendly interest and of energy expressed beyond the circle of self-interest. You know that when you describe a man's character as noble you are not thinking, I think I should be justified in saying that you are never thinking, of the things that he does for himself. Is it "noble" that a man should serve his own interests? It is necessary, it is desirable, it is in many forms praiseworthy; but do we describe it as noble that a man should serve himself? How does he differ from other men, and where is one man to be preferred to another in nobility, if it consists in serving one's self, for does not every man within the limits of his intelligence serve himself? No, when we say that a man is noble we mean that he serves something besides himself; that he has, if I may express it, a margin, a surplus, a free capital of character, which he can expend in undertakings which are for the general welfare as well as in undertakings for himself. He is not consumed and used up in serving himself; there is a generous remainder which he is ready to share with his neighbors

and with his fellow-citizens and with his friends. And so nobility is this fine exercise of one's quality outside of the narrow circle of self-interest.

It seems to me that it is but an extension of these terms when we speak of patriotism. Patriotism is this fine, unselfish exercise of energy, and it is not, as I began by saying, a mere expression of sentiment. You know that one of the drawbacks in speaking about patriotism is that a man has a certain self-consciousness of what he himself does and does not do, and he feels that the expression of noble purpose is in itself a cheap thing. How shall a man consent to have his own patriotism examined? He shrinks from that. He fears to be suspected of cheap sentiment, and to be challenged to show where he has realized it in action. His fear is an illustration of the principle that I am insisting upon, namely, that character does not show itself in the mere utterance of the sentiments of the lip. I have heard some excellent sentiments of patriotism associated with very base conduct. I have heard some very selfish purposes served by the expression of the sentiment of patriotism. We know that the sentiment itself is cheap, but that the duty is dear, and that when men express themselves in action we then for the first time uncover ourselves and know that we stand in the presence of men who serve their country as well as themselves. I take that to be one of the things which makes us stand with no word of criticism in the presence of the great admiral whom we have so recently been honoring, because we know that he did not undertake what he undertook for glory, but in the way of service.

I was very much interested in what one of our naval officers said to me the other day. He was expressing, I think with a little pique, his surprise at the astonishment of the country at the readiness of the navy for the war. "Why," he said, "I have been in the navy sixteen years, and all those sixteen years we have been ready to give a ball or go into battle in fifteen minutes." These men, therefore, have lived not to glorify themselves in this service, but as always ready for service, and when they have contained themselves after winning victories

we have known in how deep a sense they were serviceable men.

The moral obviously is, that we cannot serve our country, and no man can serve his country, unless we know what the country is and what it stands for. How shall I be patriotic, how shall any man be patriotic, who does not understand the object of his devotion? It is a more serious thing, it seems to me, to be a citizen of this country than to be a citizen of any other country, unless it be the country to which we are nearest akin; because I always remember when I think of this government of ours that interesting sentence in DeTocqueville in which he says: "One is startled to perceive the variety of information and the excellence of discretion which its Constitution presupposes in the people whom it is meant to govern." The variety of information; the excellence of discretion. You are trusting a great body of men to govern themselves, and you are thereby trusting them to understand their polity and to adopt a policy which is suitable to that polity. This excellence of discretion will not come without knowledge, without that variety of information which DeTocqueville associates with it; and it seems to me that the first and most noble characteristic of our polity is that it is a debating and an intellectual polity. I do not know of any other polity that depends upon nicer questions of law, upon nicer balances of arrangement, and therefore it is an intellectual polity, because it requires nicety of discrimination to be understood, and it also requires that a man should know the objects for which all this nice machinery is adjusted in order that he may not put it to the wrong uses and damage it in the using. It is a debating polity. Why? If you would know why it is a debating polity, you must remember how it originated.

We have seen a good many singular things happen recently. We have been told that it is unpatriotic to criticise public action. Well, if it is, then there is a deep disgrace resting upon the origins of this nation. This nation originated in the sharpest sort of criticism of public policy. We originated, to put it in the vernacular, in a kick, and if it be unpatriotic to kick, why, then, the grown man is unlike the child. We have forgotten the very

principle of our origin if we have forgotten how to object, how to resist, how to agitate, how to pull down and build up, even to the extent of revolutionary practices if it be necessary, to readjust matters. I have forgotten my history if that be not true history. When I see schoolrooms full of children, going through genuflections to the flag of the United States, I am willing to bend the knee if I be permitted to understand what history has written upon the folds of that flag. If you will teach the children what the flag stands for, I am willing that they should go on both knees to it. But they will get up with opinions of their own; they will not get up with the opinions which happen to be the opinions of those who are instructing them. They will get up critical. They will get up determined to have opinions of their own. They will know that this is a flag of liberty of opinion, as well as of political liberty in questions of organization.

I am not saying this because I am as much disposed as some are to criticise recent events, but because I love, more deeply than I love anything else, the right of other men to hold opinions different from my own. If I had to live among men who always agreed with me I know what the consequences would be on my character and development, and I do not wish to live in any so placid and complaisant a community. I wish the rigorous airs of differences of opinion, and, if I am not able to fight it out for myself, I want some better champion on my side. A man's muscles are made, as I understand it, for use, for contention, for triumph, and I take it that his opinions are made for the same thing. We belong, therefore, to a contesting, a debating, an intellectual polity, where difference of opinion is, as it were, a sort of mandate of conscience, and where things prosper and are purified, because there are differences of opinion, and not because there is unity in opinion. That is the rigorous condition upon which we live. I believe that the weakness of the American character is that there are so few growlers and kickers amongst us. We would be better served, from the street cars up, if we were all of us accustomed to make things very disagreeable (laughter). You know that Mr. Bagehot very wittily said, that the freedom of the English Constitution consisted in

this, that all sorts of conveniences were afforded for making it disagreeable for the men who were governing the country; and it is because of the instinctive desire of persons to get agreeable conditions to live under that governors are conformable to the general opinion of those whom they are governing. We have heard that the government of France, under the old régime, was limited by epigram, because a laugh at its expense made the court feel uneasy, and so the court was guided in such a way as to avoid a too disagreeable laugh. Such are the conditions of conformity to the opinions of a people, and this is the sort of polity that we live under, and I rejoice in that fact.

But it lays a burden upon the teacher, such as can be laid under no other polity in respect to the matter that we have to discuss, namely, education in patriotism. I suppose that on the face of it it sounds absurd to say that you are educating people in patriotism, but it sounds absurd only if you regard patriotism merely as a sentiment. I do not know how to educate persons in generous sentiment; I know how to educate people in fear. You can make people afraid of you, if you have power enough and are disagreeable enough, but I do not know any means of making people love you—I mean deliberately; for every man remembers the days of his youth when he tried the experiment (laughter). There is no known prescription by which you can compel anybody to love you. The generous, sympathetic sentiments are not subject to compulsion. The fearful sentiments, the timorous sentiments, and the base sentiments are subject to compulsion, but you would not class patriotism with them. Patriotism is a bold and aggressive and initiative sentiment, and it is a sentiment of sympathy, above all things, and you cannot compel a sentiment of sympathy unless you display the lovable qualities which inhere in the object which you would have loved; and then you know that, if they be properly displayed, it shall be a poor spirit that does not feel its love called forth, and that it is a matter of despair to lead a nation which will not love lovely things. So that the object of the teacher, it seems to me, in matters of patriotism, should be to show what is inherent and essential in the character of American institutions, and so call

out those generous sentiments which must rise at the sight of lovely objects.

And yet you will see at once that the essential objects, the essential characteristics of our government, are very abstract things. They are things which are not only abstract, but, which is worse, are abstract *and familiar*. After you have rubbed an abstraction over by constant handling it becomes almost impossible to retain it in your hand. It has become so slippery, so worn with use, so handled by the inexpert fingers of men, that it is covered over with all sorts of accretions and mistakes and it is the more difficult to recognize because it has been so much dealt with. I conceive the three central abstractions which lie in the character of our government to be these: Self-government, liberty, and equality. What man, what child, does not have to be dispossessed of prepossessions with regard to these three things? How much mistaken talk there has been about all of them. Most of the mistakes have been committed in this country, because we have supposed that self-government—we have not supposed it really, because we, after all, are not insane, but we have talked as if we supposed—that self-government and liberty and equality originated, were born and nursed in this country. No man who knows any history, or, rather, who chooses to recollect his history when he is talking about these things, can imagine that that is true. We did not originate these desirable things. We did not originate liberty or self-government. Some people think we never have invented equality yet. And we talk about these things as if, should they not be found here, it were impossible to find them anywhere. That is the first thing we have to dispossess our thought of. Any teacher who teaches a child that the flag of the United States is the only flag that stands for self-government and liberty and equality is teaching a radical error. We believe, I certainly believe, that the most serviceable forms of self-government and liberty and equality have been found under the institutions of this country; but that is all that I can say. It is a matter of comparative excellence; it is not a matter of originality or of absolute excellence. And so you have to teach your children where self-government came

from and what it is, where liberty came from and what it is, where equality came from and what it is, and I take it that that is a very difficult matter.

I was led to this conclusion in preparing to make this address to you. I have never realized before so clearly as I think I realize now what the task involves; and I was naturally led to think, therefore, upon the possibility of this sort of instruction. Shall you teach young children these abstract matters of self-government and liberty and equality? And it came into my mind as I thought that it would be possible to write a book. I am not going to write it; I should have to start over again and be a bigger man; but it would be possible for a man of the right caliber to write a book which would be an incomparable suggestor of patriotism. If he were to write it so that self-government would shine in attractive instances, as concrete as the life in the midst of which we live; if he would embody liberty in the story of great passages of liberty; if he would embody equality in the fortunes of men who had lived and whose biographies we familiarly knew, he would bring these things into very life before the eyes of those who looked, because the advantage that we have in teaching these things is that we have instances at hand. I take it that French teachers could have no instances at hand of these things. I am not willing to disparage the French character, for it has many traits which we may envy, but I have noticed, in the books which I am condemned because of my profession to read, that those writers who live in countries that have not had real self-government find the questions of self-government very easy to treat. I find that politics is simplicity itself with the men who have never lived any part of politics, and that it is difficult for us to speak of these things because we are "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." We remember a few things, we have tried a few things, we know a few men, and we know how unlovely the mass of men are who profess these splendid principles. We have attended mass meetings of our fellow-citizens and we know of what stuff they are made and by what passions they are moved; and we know that, although you may know every man in your neighborhood, if you

gather all those men in a mass meeting they will do something to surprise you. You know that the orbits of political bodies are absolutely incalculable, that the only thing you can be sure of is some sort of an eclipse (laughter), some sort of an obscuration, particularly of heavenly bodies (laughter). And, therefore, we have an advantage and a disadvantage. We can express these things in terms of life, but the difficulty is to express them in simple terms of life, such as we could imagine them expressible in if we did not know life as well as we know it. We have the disadvantage of being workmen in the stuff and knowing how unmanageable it really is, and yet the advantage of having all handled the stuff and knowing in the main what it is like. We are, therefore, safer when we think in individual instances than when we think in the abstract.

Now I think there are a few points which we can illustrate to children or to anybody else. In the first place, with regard to self-government, for I want to be very practical indeed. In regard to self-government we can illustrate the point that it is not in its essence democratic. If it were, when did it begin? You know that self-government runs back, at any rate, as far as Magna Charta. Did England have democratic institutions immediately after Magna Charta, and has she had democratic institutions during most of the period from Magna Charta down to the present time? Certainly not. And yet the history of self-government is the history of England in mediaeval and modern times, until this government was established; and ours is a very recent and modern growth. It is very easy to show children self-government, if England had it, is not necessarily democratic. You can show them if you will tell them stories about English justices of the peace—and you can get plenty of them—that English self-government in local matters consisted in the administration of those matters by appointed justices of the peace down to the year 1888; that so far as national affairs were concerned, it consisted in an imperfect system of representation down to 1832, and a not very much more perfect system since 1832; and that down to 1888 it consisted in government, administrative government all along the line, by men appointed

by the Crown, the principal country gentlemen of their neighborhood. That certainly is not democratic. Why do you call it *self-government*, then? You call it self-government because it is a participation by non-official persons in the conduct of affairs; by persons who, in the case of justices of the peace, got no pay for it, made no profession of it, were appointed because of their importance in the locality, and not because of their connection with the national government; who were not officers of the central government in the sense that modern administrative officers are. And you can show that during much of the period of representation in Parliament it was merely a talking body and not a legislative body, and that its advantage was that it made the rulers feel uncomfortable rather than that they told them what they had to do. You can illustrate these things by concrete instances taken out of Parliament. Can you not describe situations in the history of England, and can you not describe how certain fearless men stood up in Parliament, under dramatic circumstances which any child's imagination will take fire at, and told the situation and made the government intolerably uncomfortable? Can you not describe that struggle, that critical struggle, between self-government and autocratic government, which came when Cromwell turned out the Parliament? Can you not find instances dramatic enough for any use all up and down English history to show how the English layman, as contrasted with the official, pressed himself into affairs and spoke his mind, and can you not make even children understand that the opportunity of laymen to speak their mind about affairs and get heard upon a public forum is self-government? That is the chief and essential feature of it. Just so long as European governments choke off discussion and put men in prison because of their opinions about personages in high places, they may have never so perfect a system of representation, and never so modern a constitution, and be without self-government. Self-government is the free expression of lay, non-official opinion, and I know of no other essential characteristic about it; and that is the dramatic characteristic, that is the characteristic which is concrete and illustrative

Now, you will say, if this is true of self-government—and I ask you to excuse me from a further examination of that point and simply leave it with you in order to show you what grows out of that, which you can also illustrate—if this is the essence of self-government, this non-official participation in saying what ought to be done, and saying it in a voice and from a place where men are sure of a hearing, why, then, it presupposes, and has back of it individual capacity, has it not? It has back of it some leisure for affairs, has it not? It has back of it a spirit of honor and of devotion. These are qualities which can be illustrated out of biography in a way which will quicken any pulse—devotion to affairs, the devoting of high capacity to affairs, the pledging of unimpeachable honor in affairs, the devotion of leisure to affairs; and I believe that one reason that self-government has gone some crooked courses in this country is because we have had so few men of leisure, and so few men of leisure that we did have devoted themselves to the free expression of opinion in public affairs. Who is the man whom the politician fears? The man whom it is no use to turn out of office. If in order to have a voice in affairs you must occupy office, the politician can silence you, because he can intrigue you out of office; but if you are going to have leisure and determination enough to keep on talking, and are going to have invitations to talk in public places, whether you are in office or out of office, what good does it do to turn you out of office? These are the men who make the scheming politician infinitely uncomfortable. If you can snap your finger in his face and say, "Give me the office, or give it to some one else and I will be a thorn in your side nevertheless," why, he will give you a berth, and if you will not prick too much he will give you a good deal of your way in affairs. We all know that when Mr. Roosevelt—for concrete instances are the most interesting—consorted with Mr. Platt, we grew uncomfortable; but Mr. Platt was a great deal more uncomfortable than we were (laughter and applause). They were bedfellows, but a thorn is an uncomfortable bedfellow. Although they were going the same course together, it was necessary that Mr. Platt should give himself less latitude of movement than he had given himself

before. Why? Because this popular, this gifted man, this man whom all the nation was willing to hear speak, whether they agreed with him or not, was too big a man to have it make any difference to him whether he was in office or out of office. If he had not been governor of New York, the governor of New York would have been eminently uncomfortable because he was not, and so he would have had an important part in that governorship whether he possessed the office or did not possess the office. We may agree with Mr. Roosevelt and admire him, or not agree with him and not admire him; that is a matter of indifference to my argument. My argument is that, being a man of leisure, who can find leisure enough and energy enough to talk about affairs whether he has office or not, he is the sort of man who can carry the burdens of self-government without the assistance of machinery; and, in proportion as such men are multiplied, will pure self-government, thoroughly discussed and honestly conducted, be assured us.

Which leads to another useful observation. Not only is self-government not necessarily democratic, though I believe that democracy is the soundest basis for it, but self-government, and democratic self-government, is like every other polity in the world, though it be monarchical and despotic, in this, that the burdens of it rest upon a minority. There never has been and there never will be a government that is conducted by the majority. The majority may make all the noise they please, and a very small number of persons govern in affairs. That must always be the case. And no man, no minority, can be successful in affairs—I do not mean a minority in the ordinary sense, the minority who cannot get the rest of a community to vote with them, but the minority who are actually active in affairs and influential in affairs—no minority that carries the burden of government under any polity can afford to give over attention to affairs and attend to them only at intervals. We are too much inclined to govern by committees of 100, who generally are doing nothing. If you go into the game of politics, you must go in to be there year in and year out, campaign or no campaign, having a passion for attending to the details as well

as to the greater issues, and it is only upon this condition that you shall have a sound and working polity. This means that men of leisure must devote themselves to affairs. You have, therefore, personal capacity, personal honor, leisure, and these things are susceptible of illustration in concrete instances. There is no child that cannot understand those things. When expressed in terms of conduct, of individual conduct, self-government is no longer an abstraction, it is a personal duty, and the man ought to stay awake at nights who does not realize it as a personal duty. I maintain that the man who does not exercise his notion of self-government as a personal duty ought to shut his mouth as a critic. Who is he? What has he done? Where has he spoken? A man may have the most unimpeachable sentiments in the world and he is not a good citizen unless he tries to get those sentiments adopted.

That is the rigorous condition of self-government. You shall not have exercised your duty until you have tried to make your opinions prevalent. It is a matter of agitation, and agitation is disagreeable. It is not everybody that likes to speak to a hostile audience. I think the best spirits sometimes like hostility a little better than sympathy, because it gets the fighting blood up in them and they do their thinking as if for life or for death. But that is insisting upon the impact of your thought upon other minds that do not like that impact; it is making yourself disagreeable in the long run to the vast majority of the people with whom you associate.

Now as to liberty. Liberty does not seem to me an abstraction. It goes without saying—it is a commonplace to say—that liberty is not the withdrawing of all restraints. Liberty is having just restraint enough. Do we say that a boat sails free when she is not restrained by the wind? Is it not her obedience to the wind that makes her free? Is it not her obedience to the great forces moving about her that puts her own faculties, for she seems fairly to possess faculties, at her disposal? When Emerson poetically bids us hitch our wagons to a star, he means that we must go in the direction in which the solar system is going or else we will get run over. My physical freedom

depends upon my obedience to the laws of nature. Am I free to move? It is because I have been trained since a toddling child to obey the laws of equilibrium, the laws of attraction, the laws of gravitation. I am a living embodiment and illustration of the laws of gravitation, and that makes me free. If I disobeyed the laws of nature, ate what I ought not to eat, how immediate my slavery would be. If you want to know when you are a slave, count the number of times the doctor visits you. You have committed an indiscretion by not being conformable to the laws of nature, and you have forfeited your liberty in respect of that, and nature says to you, "Thou fool."

It seems to me that liberty is illustrated more nearly than we at first think by such illustrations as this. Liberty is the best adjustment between governmental power and individual initiative. It does not consist in individual initiative, look you; it consists in not letting individual initiative go too far and, on the other hand, in not letting governmental power act with too arbitrary a choice of means. And it seems to me that the despotism of the despot consists in the last analysis of this, that you cannot calculate today what he is going to do tomorrow, because he will do tomorrow what he pleases without consulting you. He may be gracious to you today and send you to the block tomorrow, and you want to know how to calculate your orbit so as not to run athwart the block. You know what lawyers say. Lawyers say that swift and consistent injustice is better than slow and inconsistent justice. It is a great deal better that you should be able to know and make your calculations beforehand, know where the government is coming and where you can come, know which is your field and which is the field of government, so that there shall not be collision; and this adjustment constitutes your liberty. In proportion as the adjustment is the best adjustment (and we have never found what the best adjustment is), you have the best and completest liberty; because it is a social question and not an individual question. Do you think that Robinson Crusoe was a particularly free man? Would you be as free as you are now if you had to get and cook all your own food, and make your clothes and hats and shoes, and build

your own house? Do you think you would be as free a man then as under the coöperative system under which you live? Freedom is a social question and your faculties are set free on the condition that most things are taken care of by somebody else. You do not run the greater part of the arrangements of the world, and you thank your stars that you do not, because it leaves you, you say, free; it leaves you free to occupy your own individual little corner and do your own individual little tasks. That is your freedom, that you are a member of the coöperative society which we call the body politic.

There is a passage of Burke's that is pertinent in this connection, and whenever Burke can be read he ought to be read. "I should suspend my congratulations on the new liberty of France," he says in his *Reflections on the French Revolution* (I never have been able to understand how people thought that that was a hysterical production; but then some people have not read it), "I should suspend my congratulations on the new liberty of France until I was informed how it had been combined with government." He has just had an eloquent passage in which he admits, more eloquently than we could admit, all the excellence of liberty; but he could not congratulate a nation upon its liberty until he knew how it was combined with other things just as excellent, "combined with government, with public force; with the discipline and obedience of armies; with the collection of an effective and well-distributed revenue; with morality and religion; with the solidity of property; with peace and order; with civil and social manners." Liberty is like the ingredients in our food; it is excellent in mixture and not by itself, and in proportion as it is happily compounded you shall have an excellent thing.

You will observe, therefore, in looking down the illustrative parts of history in this connection, this circumstance. Men have seldom been unfree taking whole societies at a time. There is in almost every society, no matter how undeveloped the idea of liberty may be, some free class. And liberty has had a history of percolation downwards; so that class after class which had formerly been depressed and subordinate was elevated and put

upon an equality with others in the enjoyment of this right balance between individual privilege and public power. Most of the time what has been going on has been this: that the privileged class which was free did not sympathetically understand or care for the conditions precedent to the liberty of the classes underneath them. There have been periods in history when it was perfectly evident that the governing class wished to take beneficent action for those who were depressed below them, but wished it in ignorance of what really was for the benefit of those depressed below them. Liberty has consisted in the widening of the idea, not that some men should have their privilege adjusted to the public power, but that as many men as possible should have their individual privileges rightly adjusted to the public power. The history of liberty has been a history of the spreading of an idea which men, some men, have entertained from the first, and of a thing which some classes have enjoyed from the first.

So that liberty depends upon what we have hitherto pretty nearly had in this country; and that is the reason, it seems to me, that this has been the home of liberty more distinctively, I think we are permitted to say, than other countries. You are pretty sure to have a universal acceptance of this idea, that every man is entitled to have a right adjustment between his privileges and the public power, in a country where the conditions of life are tolerably uniform, where there is no great economic or social advantage in the position of one set of men as contrasted with another, where the conditions are uniform enough to make it easy for every man to think in terms suitable to the whole community rather than in terms suitable only to the class to which he belongs in the community. Where you have equality of condition, or something like equality of condition, you have uniformity of thinking with respect to this essential matter. It is perfectly possible to illustrate to the youngest mind, it seems to me, this conception, that in order to have liberty men must consent to think of other men as they think of themselves; and that it may be shown that, although the Golden Rule is imperative upon all men, it is easiest to follow in a society of tolerable

uniform economic conditions. How can I wish to do unto others as I would have them do unto me unless I know what will be beneficial to them and unless they know what will be beneficial to me? I cannot think in the terms of their experience unless I am near enough to their experience to think so spontaneously and without too great an effort of the imagination, because the imagination is a very much dwarfed faculty in most persons, particularly the social imagination. I do not know anything that needs a nicer schooling than the ability to see the conditions under which other men live, and think for other men in the terms of their conditions. That is the reason that most charity mis-carries, because we cannot think of the persons to whom we would be helpful in the terms of their lives and therefore do not know how to help them. If you have a community such as this has for the most part of its history been, where men have been constantly moving from class to class and where men of the most eminent position have been at some time in a very humble position, you have a community where it is easy for men to think in the terms of each other, and therefore you have a country in which liberty is most likely to be diffused. And you have another thing. You have a community which is able to understand the general welfare as contrasted with the individual welfare. If you have movable atoms in the mass and they have experienced the atmosphere of different parts of the mass, you can explain the general atmosphere of the mass to them and they will understand, because they have been there themselves.

It is just exactly like traveling. A man after he has traveled over this country and seen his fellow-citizens in distant parts of the continent is ashamed of himself for having been so narrow a creature before he traveled, for having thought such ignorant thoughts and such superior thoughts about his fellow-citizens. The best dose for the man who would be a thinking man is to see the people he is thinking about and see the parts of the country he is thinking about, and going to see for himself what is "the matter with Kansas," because just so soon as he does he comes back *pari passu* a Kansan himself, and he is able to tell you, if he has had eyes and is an honest man, he is almost as able to

tell you as if he had lived in Kansas, what is "the matter with Kansas." It is just so in moving from class to class as well as from place to place. Men who have experienced the various conditions of the societies in which they live are men who, when they are constituent parts of a political meeting, can understand the general welfare when it is explained to them, because they know the various parts and elements that go to make up the general welfare. You can illustrate this sympathy, you can illustrate this interrelationship of class, you can illustrate this common experience, you can illustrate all the terms of the simple life of this nation, better than you can illustrate the variety that is in the life of other nations; and the task of teaching the ideal liberty, that is to say, an equal adjustment of private privilege to public power, is easier here than it is anywhere else.

And then what about equality? What is equality? We no longer entertain the opinions that we used to entertain about the Declaration of Independence. There used to be a time when we took the Declaration of Independence literally; but we don't, we take it now in a *Pickwickian* sense. At any rate, if we believe that all men are born free and equal, we know that the freedom and equality stops at their birth (laughter), because we see what men would be blind not to see, and what of course Mr. Jefferson saw as clearly as we see, that after you have once put men upon this starting line of birth and set them on their course they do not remain equal, the one outruns the other, the achievement of one is not matchable with the achievement of another, and at the goal there is disparity, though at the starting line there may have been equality. We are not deceiving ourselves any longer by supposing that we can ever invent a machinery of government which will keep the slow runners up with the fast runners. And, moreover, we want to see a race (great laughter). We believe that the best training is in competition. We believe that keen competition is the growth of the individual, and we would not so dwarf ourselves as to give every man a handicap that would make him equal with every other man. And so we know, when we ask ourselves what we mean by equality, that we mean exactly what the sportsman means when he says "A fair

field and no favor." That is all that we mean by political equality, all that it is practicable that we should mean.

What we object to in government is that it should show favor to some contestants for the prize, that it should put some men under easier conditions for competing than other men are put under. The reason we criticise the existing economic order is not because it does not give every man the same benefit of labor, but because we see that in some particulars it creates artificial advantages in competition for some men from which other men are shut out. It is not a fair field and there is favor. That is the reason we do not want lobbyists in our legislatures. That is the reason we do not want money spent in elections. That is the reason we do not want the men who already have money to have all the advantage that money is to get. It is because there is not a fair field and there is favor that we are troubled about affairs. If we can invent means, as we shall invent means, I feel confident—because so long as my digestion holds I am an optimist (laughter)—we shall find means, I firmly believe, to equalize the field at the start, so that there shall be a fair field, no interference even by the spectators, much less by the authorities of the course, and no favor shown to any contestant. That is the essence of equality. It is the equality of chance, of opportunity, and not the equality of results, for we should have a dead uniformity and the absence of growth if there were equality in result.

I have detained you long enough, it seems to me, in the illustration of what is, after all, obvious enough, but I have done so because I wished to make you appreciate, as it seems to me it is easy to appreciate, how concrete all of these things are. What characteristic and representative American biography does not illustrate this sort of equality? You can take the biography that most of all represents America, the biography of Lincoln, and there you have a man originating in a class from which we expected to find initiative stamped out, ambition long ago dead, a man from that class coming to be a prince among men because there was a fair field and no favor, and blood and origin did not shut a man out, and merit and endeavor were the only things

that told. Is not that an example of equality? The adult, and I think the child also, will rejoice in the apparent paradox: the supremacy of Lincoln, the fact that he stands higher than the rest of us, is an illustration of equality. We all have the chance, if we have but fiber for it, to get to the same pedestal, and it is only when there is a fence around the pedestal and everybody is forbidden to compete for it that there is no equality.

But there is something else besides the understanding of these fundamentals which is necessary, it seems to me, to understand and to teach patriotism, and that is the right critical temper. And let me say it, I say it with the greater freedom because I am a teacher myself, I think that teachers find it more difficult than others to preserve a right critical temper about affairs, because they do the easiest thing in the world, they read books. It is easy to be wise out of books, but it is infinitely difficult to be wise in the midst of affairs. The man who sits in the calmness and stillness of a study and cavils at a man who is in the midst of the infinitely various and difficult affairs of the actual arena of public matters should be very careful to revise his judgments before he utters them and to realize the difficulties before he condemns the man. You must teach people, you must teach yourself, every man must teach himself, to learn from looking upon the face of affairs and from understanding the characters of the actors upon the stage upon which you yourselves are moving, as well as the easy task of reading out of biographies and recording past events. How often have we seen in the biographies of men dead and gone, the sufficient explanation, the honorable explanation, for things which we condemned in them while they lived, and why is it that we, if we stand near to some men in the midst of the rush of public affairs, are lenient critics of them, and those who did not see them in their private lives are harsh critics of them? Because those who did not know them do not know their tempers and do not understand their motives. We should all of us try by imagination to be statesmen ourselves, not with regard to questions which are settled, but with regard to questions which are pendent, and

then we shall know what is the hard school for the right temper, the right critical temper in affairs.

There is a great deal of point, it seems to me, in this: we are constantly dissatisfied because, when we criticise affairs people will say to us, "Well, what would you do? What do you suggest?" and we say, "We have nothing to suggest, we just do not like what is being done." I say that that is very trying; but you must really submit to that if you are going to have any place in affairs. If you have nothing to propose it is not instructive that you should say that you do not like what is being done. When teachers stand up and say to their pupils, "These men did wrong," it is their business to say what it would have been right for these men to do "What would you have done under the circumstances?" That is the hardest question in the world, and yet it is the only question that is worth answering in affairs. I am not interested in your opinion; nobody is interested in your negative opinion. If you have something to suggest, suggest it. You know that Mr. Bagehot wittily said that the French, with their excellent gift of language, could say anything, but that they did not have anything to say; and it was Mr. Birrell who said: "If you would have me believe you a wit, I must really trouble you to make a joke." Now, if you would really have me believe that you are wise in affairs I must really trouble you to suggest something, because it is only by positive action, and not by criticism alone, that affairs are conducted. There is a function for mere negative criticism, that is to say, there is a function for more destruction, to bring men who are doing foolish things to a consciousness of their folly, but do not propose this criticism as statesmanship until you have something better to suggest. I am not now squinting at pending questions, that would be impertinent under these circumstances; I am simply stating plainly what I conceive to be the proper position of the teacher. You have no business teaching patriotism or touching upon affairs unless you have the temper and the frame of mind to stand in the midst of affairs, and you have no place in the midst of affairs unless you have these practical standards of judgment. Something must be done, and you

must get the right critical attitude toward things that are proposed.

I realize, ladies and gentlemen, that I have simply given you a very rough outline of matters which need very much more careful elaboration and statement than I have given them, but my object has been simply to assist, if I may, in some small degree, your thinking in this matter, and not to furnish a body of doctrine. I esteem it a privilege to have addressed this audience, and I thank you most sincerely for your attention.

MORNING SESSION

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1899

The association met, pursuant to adjournment, at 9 A. M., and proceeded with its business meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: The hour having come for the presentation of the subject, "The Continuous Moral Influence of the School through College and through Life," I desire to say that the committee which had charge of the preparation of the proceedings of this meeting felt sure that they had in this subject one interesting to all members of the association, college men and school men alike, and they were also sure that they had selected to present this subject a person admirably qualified to deal with it. I present to you the Rev. Endicott Peabody of Groton School.

THE CONTINUOUS MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE SCHOOL THROUGH COLLEGE AND THROUGH LIFE

By ENDICOTT PEA BODY,
Of Groton School

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I have heard the story told of a man that he had so much to do that he went fishing. I am sure we are all agreed that that was written of the schoolmaster. As I approached this subject, it seemed to me that it must have been written of one who attempted this theme

of the Continuous Moral Influence of the School through College and through Life. It is so vast that one can only touch on a few of the salient points; and so I decided to make an informal address, hoping that by discussing this subject together we might strike out some truths which might be of value to us in this important theme. It really seems to me the most important of all things connected with schools.

As one reads the lives of the great schoolmasters of England I think one is struck with the profound interest that they take in the development of character. It is for this reason, I believe, that the English schools have had such an influence upon the lives of the men of England today. It is not because they are great in their knowledge of scientific teaching; English schoolmasters know very little about pedagogy and care rather less. I went to one of the great schools of England, a school which wins more scholarships at the universities than almost any other school, and I was talking with one of the leading men in the school. I said: "What do you think of Froebel's methods, and of the theories of the German educationalists?" He replied: "Oh, they are all rot" (laughter). "They do very well for German boys, but they won't do for English boys," he said; "What we do is to give a boy a Latin grammar and make him learn it, that is the only way to teach" (applause). That theory obtains throughout the schools of England to a great extent, and yet I say that the influence of the schools upon character is greater than the influence of our schools today.

I was talking to a gentleman who came up to Groton not long ago and explaining to him that we had an extra half-holiday that day because one of our graduates had succeeded in getting a scholarship at the university. I dilated with some pleasure on this fact. The man was a literary man, and I thought he would be especially interested in it. When I stopped, he said, "Well, being a shallow scholar I am a good deal more interested to know that some of your boys are captains of the university teams, because I am not at all alarmed about the intellectual life of this country. We Americans are shrewd enough and keen enough and clever enough intellectually. What we want to do is to raise up a race

of men—they may be dull men, but men who see their duty ahead of them and are determined at any cost to achieve that duty. That is the great need in America today."

I speak, I am afraid, from only a very partial, a narrow point of view, for one who has charge of boys at a boarding school. I know nothing about the education of girls. I hope that some of the things that I say may be principles which will apply to the training of girls. I am sure that the boarding school has a great many problems in common with the day school. I must confess that I have departed from the subject as it was given to me by the secretary of the committee. He said "The Continuous Moral Influence of the School through College and through Life." As I thought it over, the subject seemed to push itself back into the school. To make the school influence continuous through college and through life you have got to be sure, first of all—and this is a thing that we are not always sure of—that the moral influence of the school is moral. You have got to be sure that there is a moral influence exerted by the school upon the scholars while they are there. If you make that deep enough, if you make that intense enough, it will grow into the characters of the boys, and, as a matter of course, it will continue through college and through life. Therefore, the larger part of my talk has to do with the way in which one may establish a sound moral influence at the school, and it has to do not so much with methods as with persons.

Personality is the great thing, it seems to me, in education. If you get a great teacher, like Arnold, of Rugby, or Dr. Thring, of Uppingham, or Mark Hopkins in this country, or Dr. Dimmock, of whom one hears a great deal in New England, why, you have achieved the whole thing, practically; but for ordinary men and ordinary schools the question is of the whole staff of teachers. The teachers make the school. Now, what kind of teachers shall we have in the schools? The same question, it seems to me, the same principles, underlie the choice of teachers in the university. It is here that the English show so much wisdom. They send their very best men into the schools. A Rugby master told me that in his time, some ten years ago, at Rugby,

every master at that school had been a Fellow at his college at Oxford or at Cambridge. That means that it would be possible for the large majority of those men to have got the positions of teachers at the university. But they preferred to put in their life among boys, believing that that was the most effective thing for the nation. It seems to me that the tendency in this country is—we are very fond of titles—to prefer the position of assistant or sub-assistant professor in a college to that of an assistant master at a school.

Now, the kind of teacher. What is it that we ask for in a teacher? He ought to be a good scholar. That goes without saying. And yet scholarship is not the first thing. You must have a man who is well educated, you must have an intelligent man, you want an intellectual man; and yet there are things distinctly more important. One has known great scholars complete failures as teachers in schools. I remember Arnold laid great stress upon the necessity that a man should be a man of lively manner. That does not seem to have much connection with morality, and yet it does show a sympathetic mind. A man must be a man of lively manner, he must be a man of fine character, and he must be a man who loves boys. That is the essence of the whole thing—a man who takes up the work at school because he cares for boys, and they know it; they know it within an hour or two of the time that the man arrives at the school.

I was describing the life of a boarding-school master the other day to one of our parents and pointed out the fact that there is a great deal of wear and tear in such a life. A man gets up in the morning and he may have a lot of boys in the dormitory to look after. He goes to breakfast with a large number of boys. He begins his work. He teaches through the morning school, and when 12 o'clock comes and the bell rings he is not free. He is expected to go out, perhaps, to play on some team with the boys, or else they look for him to come and coach them in their games. The small boy who was walking by his father's side, remarked: "Do you mean to say, Mr. Peabody, that the masters don't all stay in the house and study during the day?" (Laughter.) There is a loss, there is a sacrifice

necessary for a schoolmaster. He cannot study all through the day. He has got to give up a good deal in his intellectual life. And yet, yet, if character is the first thing, if the moral life is what we care for most, a man is willing to sacrifice that. If you do not do it, if you do not have men who are willing to make the sacrifice, then you get a great gap between the masters and the students. I was told not long ago by a man who is now in college, one of our New England colleges, that it was enough for the faculty to ask the men to do a thing for them to want not to do it. You want to have, of course, in a university, you must have, your great scholars; in your school you want your men who have had experience, who are skillful and practiced teachers; but in both places, I believe, you want young men who are in sympathy with both the undergraduates and the faculty and keep the one in touch with the other.

The foundation of it all, and that which is absolutely necessary, without which you cannot have any moral life in the school, is religion. Thring—I dare say a great many of you have read his life—says that no one can keep fresh, as a teacher, except he does it from a feeling of doing work for Christ, in that knowledge without religion cannot make better lives. Dr. Wilson, who used to be the head master of Clifton College in England, has described the ideal master in this way: "Of all the intellectual and moral elements that go to make a master, the originality that does not despise method, the flexibility of mind and sternness of character, the sympathy with learners and attitude of ever learning, the instinctive appreciation of small traits of character, the love of human souls that will count no pains too great to save a boy, that never despairs of a lad, the sense of duty that sustains in wearisome routine, the deep undercurrent of character that makes the whole life a conscious, though very often secret, service of God, the last is, as any wide experience will show, the most precious of all," and if it is there the boys find it and the deepest love of a boy can only be aroused by that.

And now in regard to the boys in their relation to one another and to the masters and to the school. It is the greatest

power that is in a school and we want to control it. Boys are natural hero worshipers, and you want to take advantage of that. There are two theories, two ways it seems to me, two systems, by which schools may be conducted. The first system is that of *laissez faire*, where you do the best that you can to create a good general atmosphere in the school and then you give boys practically entire freedom. Those who survive become strong and fine characters, those who do badly are dropped, and those who do positively evil things are expelled. The result of that is that you may keep your school in pretty good condition. The drawback to it is that there is such an awful waste, and it is a dreadful thing to waste human life. The other system is to use the boys as fellow workers with the masters to prevent evil arising, not the nursery system, but the scientific system, to keep the whole body thoroughly sound, to prevent rather than to cure. To do that you establish what is called the monitor system, or the prefect system. I would like to talk about that at some length, if I may.

It seems to me such a great thing to get the older boys to coöperate with the school, to become fellow workers with the masters. The authority that is given to them is practically the same authority that is given to the masters, and their relation with the masters, and with the head master, perhaps, especially, is that of entire confidence. They talk with the head master or with the other masters about anything, about everything, what concerns themselves, what concerns other boys, what concerns the school. The dangers in that system I have no doubt have occurred to your mind as I have been speaking. The most obvious danger is the growth of espionage, of telling tales. That is a thing which at once occurs to everybody. A pretty sound argument in favor of the system, showing that it is not a danger which is always realized, is that after fourteen or fifteen years of experience with the system the boys with whom I have had to do are absolutely in favor of it.

The essence of tale-telling is malice. If a boy comes to a master with a story about another boy, hoping that the master is going to punish that other boy for doing the thing which is

complained of, that is telling tales. That can be stamped out of a school in one half day. There is no difficulty about that at all. The boys must be perfectly certain that the reason why a master wants to know about another boy and about the school is exactly the same reason for which the father wants to know about his son—in order that, if anything is in any way going wrong, he may be able to help that boy to recover himself. The prefect takes the position of the older brother in the family. There is a danger of a boy in a moment of enthusiasm saying more than he intends. That is not often realized. In that case, the master is especially careful not to deal with the facts that he has in such a way that, as the boy goes back to think over what he has said, his conscience would be injured. There is a danger of self-satisfaction, of priggishness. And yet that, it seems to me, if the system is perfectly naturally carried out, is no greater than danger in the home life, where the older brother talks with the father about what is going on in the family.

Now the advantages. One great advantage is this: The tendency, I fancy, that is common to all of us, the tendency of the school-teacher, is to live in a fool's paradise. He sees the scholars young and attractive, they are courteous, full of life and freshness, and he says, "The whole thing is all right." I heard of a man showing somebody over his school not long ago; "there was life, abounding life." My friend looked on the table at one or two books of a most questionable nature in that particular room where there was so much life. It is a tremendous temptation to live in a fool's paradise, to see everything beautiful and think it is all right underneath. With this system you know pretty well, the kind of things that are going on in the school; and when you find that something is wrong with a particular boy what you do is this: you call some boy who knows that fellow, who is brought into relation with him naturally in some way, and you say, "That boy is not doing particularly well. Cannot you help him?" In a very short time you will notice a distinct difference in the lad's behavior. You take advantage of the intense admiration which the younger boys, have for their seniors in the school. A small boy was

anxious to get up early to go down to study. He came to his dormitory master and said, "I want to go down at half past six, but I am obliged to open my window, the window in my dormitory, at seven." The master said, "Well, you may go down and study and I will tell the prefect about the window." He met the boy after breakfast and the boy said to him, "Did you speak to the prefect about that window, sir?" "Yes." "What did the prefect say?" (Laughter.)

Another very great advantage, and this has a direct bearing, I think, on the continuous influence of the school through college, is that the boys who take these positions put themselves on record as taking a strong position against evil and for righteousness. They talk over the evils that arise in the schools perfectly frankly, they learn what it is that is evil in them, and they set their faces against them for a year or two. They get into the habit of appreciating how wrong those things are, how much harm they do, and they go to college committed in their own minds to a course of clean and true living. In that kind of way you can do most, it seems to me, to establish the right kind of *esprit de corps*. I have found it very helpful in that way. Only last year one of the prefects was asked to go to some supper room after the theater. This came to me quite indirectly, but blessings as well as curses come home to roost with the school-master after a while. He was asked to go to some supper room after the theater, and he said no, he would not go. The boys who were with him, said, "Better go. Why not?" "Well" he said, "I think it would be a bad thing for the school if I should go." You can get the boys so interested in the school in this kind of way that they will abstain, not only from things which they believe to be absolutely wrong, but from things which they believe to be harmful to the school. I do not say that this is true in all instances. I am painting a fair picture. I am painting, not things which have been actually achieved—that particular thing was—but the ideals toward which we are trying to move.

Those are the two great powers: teachers who love boys, who are bent upon righteousness, and boys who will sympathize with the masters in trying to establish pure and clean and

righteous living in the school. Then there are methods, there are certain things which one wants to establish in the school. It seems to me of the utmost importance that there should be nothing in the nature of loafing in a school. The curse of American college life and of school life is loafing (applause). Boys and men get together in a sociable way and sit round a room and talk and gossip, and a little scandal comes in, and then evil. The tone of loafers, is always low. You can avoid that easily in a school, because you have the great advantage of athletics. One has not the slightest hesitation in saying that to run a school on a high standard of morality without athletics would be a practical impossibility. Athletics are of the most immense importance in establishing righteousness in the school. What do the boys do? What do they talk about? For moral evil you have got to consider the care of the body, and the best thing for a boy is to work hard and then, after a short interval, to play hard, and then to work hard again and then to play hard again, and then, when the end of the day has come, to be so tired that he wants to go to bed and go to sleep. That is the healthy and good way for a boy to live. What is he going to talk about? You cannot get boys to talk about the ethical conceptions of Shakespeare's plays or the political economy of the Japanese; they are going to talk about something which comes close to their lives. The talk of athletics is sometimes a bit tiresome, but I am not at all sure that in the holidays one hears anything for regular diet that is much better. It is very apt to be the condition of the stock market, or the price of some things in the market, or wine, or cigars, or something of that kind. Boys' topics are healthier, on the whole, I think, than those touched upon in the average conversation at the average table.

The treatment of moral offenses. It seems to me most important that moral offenses should be treated *as* moral offenses and not as offenses against discipline. This is a cardinal principle in establishing fair play and truthfulness in a school. One knows instances where a boy has been punished for having a translation in exactly the same way as he was punished for

throwing a piece of paper at another boy's head, and the natural inference in a boy's mind is that the nature of the two offenses is about the same. For all offenses against morality, for unfairness in work, for untruthfulness, for any moral offense, the only position to take is that it cannot be punished at all. That seems to me a fundamental thing; to talk to a boy, to show him the wrong, to point out to him the fact that if that kind of thing is done by a member of the community, the community must gradually become thoroughly unsound, that those who do things of that kind cannot remain in the community, and then to work with the parents in establishing a boy in the right way, and if he offend many times to try to help him, and finally, if he is absolutely beyond your help, to get rid of the boy; but never to punish him. Boys want to be punished. I have had boys come to me and ask if I would not give them a specific punishment. But, if they know that sin is a thing which is beyond man's treatment, they are likely to see sin in the light in which it ought to be regarded.

In regard to morality among boys, we teachers must recognize the fact that they have great temptations in the school and in the life that is coming to them at college. How are you going to help boys meet them? It seems to me that one should talk perfectly frankly to the school as a whole, at times that one should talk frankly to individuals. There is a splendid opportunity in a boarding school, when the boys are thinking of joining the church, or in a church school when they are thinking of being confirmed, when one can deal perfectly openly with questions of that kind, and help the boys in regard to their future life. I do not believe in going into details—no man who hates that kind of thing can do that—but to speak openly, and to let the boys know that the thing must not exist. Take it in the case of low conversation. That kind of thing can be driven clean out of a school if you get the older boys to coöperate with you, and if you are eternally vigilant. You can tell as you pass through a school room if all is right. If it is not you will see a group of boys together, and as you come near them they will scatter, and you know there is something

wrong there. It seems to me that it all depends upon the attitude which the masters in the school take. If they are absolutely determined that cleanliness of living shall exist in that place, and that that is the first thing, it will become the first thing in the boys' minds.

One tries in the ways I have indicated to increase the sense of responsibility as a boy grows older, and one tries at the same time to develop the idea of service. That is the essence of democracy. The democratic principle is the spirit of service. Boys are all ready for it. You can get boys to work among other boys in boys' clubs. For us, we have found a great help in that way in the establishment of a summer camp in the country. On one of the lakes of New Hampshire we have a camp, to which small boys from the city are brought. The camp is in charge of a master and of one or two graduates of the school and of several under-graduates, who change from time to time. That gives them an opportunity of serving these small boys and of finding out that it is possible for them without any very peculiar action to help the lives of those who are less fortunate. It seems to me that these two things a boy ought to have when he leaves school to go to college: the sense of responsibility for his life and the lives of others, and the desire for service. When he goes to college he will look after those who come from his own school; he will care for the life of the college because it has become a habit with him. While he is in college you try to keep in touch with him. If you find that evil is coming into his life you correspond with him. I have never found, with possibly one exception, a case where a boy who was remonstrated with because he was doing badly, resented it. He was always glad that you had followed him, that you cared for him, and that you had spoken to him frankly. The school should always be open to the graduates of the school, where they should be welcomed, where they should know that they are wanted. These are some of the ways of influencing him after the boy has left school. These I have very briefly touched upon. But it is in the school, my friends, it is in the school that we are

sowing the seed ; and if we sow the seed faithfully it is going to spring up into life, the right kind of life at college and in this world, and in the world to come (applause).

DISCUSSION

PRESIDENT C. W. ELIOT: It seemed to me that the most important principle enunciated by Mr. Peabody is one which I know Dean Briggs also insists on, namely, that grave, moral offenses in school or college are not punishable. The only question that arises about a moral offender—a confirmed moral offender—is: can he be kept in school or college? We who remember the schools and colleges of forty and fifty years ago will, I think, recognize that this principle was not usually acted on in American schools and colleges. I know it was not acted on in the Boston Public Latin School or in Harvard College. There was the utmost confusion between moral offenses and offenses against order and convenience; and this confusion I believe to have been the source of great moral evils in both college and school.

The other thing I should like to speak of before Mr. Peabody closes is the evidence which this discussion has given of the nobility of the profession of secondary-school teacher. It is quite true that a large proportion of college-bred men and women who mean to be teachers try first to get into college or university work, and exhibit some repugnance to going into secondary-school work. That I believe to be a grave error, an error from which England and Germany have escaped. I believe that in the near future we in this country must correct the prevailing view in that matter.

Another topic in Mr. Peabody's remarks which I hold to be very interesting indeed, as subject of future experiment, is the prefect or monitor system. Whether that method can be applied on a large scale in our country is for me a matter of doubt. I should not be able to affirm that the English example was encouraging. On the contrary, it seems to me that unless deep changes have been lately wrought in that method in the English public schools, it is absolutely inapplicable in our country, except, indeed, in a school like Groton, where a quite extraordinary control can be exercised by the masters. As I read the biographies of famous Englishmen who have been in the so-called public schools, as I listen to the accounts which men contemporary with us give of their own experience in those schools, it seems to me that the prefect method has been horribly abused in times past—I mean that it has been the source of horrible abuses, abuses which would

not be endured in any American community. Nevertheless, as I am sure you learned from what Dean Briggs said, it is possible to use the influence of older pupils or students upon younger to great advantage. I hardly think it is demonstrated that the older student, who is going to bring to bear on the younger a moral pressure, needs official position, whether in college or in school. It sometimes seems to me that official position is not only unnecessary, but a drawback. In recent years, in Harvard College, we have had a large experience of the beneficial influence of older students upon younger, the older being directly asked to use their influence; but so far as Harvard experience goes, there is no need of any official position for the helper.

At the close of this discussion the fourteenth annual meeting came to an end by adjournment.

RAY GREENE HULING,
Secretary

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

[The limitations of space make it possible to print here only a small portion of the discussions on the two leading topics of the meeting. These discussions will appear in full in the Proceedings of the Association, edited by the secretary, Dr. Ray Greene Huling.—EDITOR SCHOOL REVIEW].

BOOK REVIEWS

First Lessons in Civics. A Text-book for Use in Schools. By S. E. FORMAN, PH.D. (Johns Hopkins). New York: American Book Company, 1898. 192 pp.

THIS is a live book for live boys and girls below the secondary school. The order of its chapters is from the home to the school, and thence through the various local governments to the national. Its constant aim is to do two things for the young student: to connect all discussions with political events which interest him; and to nourish in him a healthy ethical purpose. In this twofold aim it succeeds well. Of its 192 pages devoted to local governments, 35 pages to state activities, and 45 pages to national affairs (leaving 10 pages to an index), there is not one that is so dead, so wholly given to the *mere anatomy of constitutions*, as were most of the pages of most text-books on civil government of a decade or two ago. From first to last it keeps the student sensitive toward the political activities which touch his own life. This is done, first by using familiar political events to illustrate general truth and principle, and, second, by valuable questions, with which nearly every chapter closes. Too many of these can be answered by yes or no, and it would have been good pedagogy to put some of them at the beginnings of chapters. A few choice references would also have been valuable. On the whole, the book is simple, scholarly, interesting, and vigorous. It should perform a distinct service for higher citizenship.

HENRY W. THURSTON

A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities: Based on Sir William Smith's larger dictionary and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. WARRE CORNISH, M.A., Vice Provost of Eton College. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1898.

THIS work corresponds in scope to Mandarin's edition of the *Classical Dictionary*, to which it is intended to be a companion volume. Like that book it is intended for the younger class of students and is

excellently adapted to the wants of pupils in our preparatory schools and undergraduates in our college courses. The main body of the work consists of 676 octavo pages. Then follow two excellent appendices of Greek (27 pp.), and Roman (49 pp.) law terms, arranged in alphabetical order. Next come tables of measures, weights, and money (26 pp.) These are followed by Greek, Latin, and English indexes (54 pp.), making a total of 829 pages.

The bulk of the illustrations (over eleven hundred in number) are wood cuts which exhibit the same merits and the same defects as Smith's *Dictionary*. Under the article Pottery there is a full page colored plate in which is reproduced a red figured and a black figured amphora and a Ckythus with white ground. Pages of description would not give so good an idea of the aspect of a Greek vase. To illustrate the article coinage, there are three plates which reproduce by photo-engraving some fifty ancient coins, each plate being accompanied by explanatory notes.

In general it can be said that the editor has exhibited no little skill in reducing the articles without thereby making the treatment meager. In many cases subjects that in the Smith are treated in several separate articles are (in this work) discussed together under a more general title, and unlike the method followed in the larger work English, as well as Latin and Greek, words are freely employed for titles. Thus the article Pottery combines the two articles Fictile and Vas of the Smith *Dictionary* and at the close, under the rubric Shapes of Vases, devotes some five pages to the illustration and description of the various types of vessels. For educational purposes this treatment is certainly superior to that of the Smith, where one has to seek illustration and description under the separate names. In the case of some of the more important types of pottery, however, there are separate entries, which in the case of the article Pateva seems to have been necessitated by the desire to add illustrations for which space was lacking in the list; in other cases, as, *e. g.*, under Trua and Trulla it is difficult to find any justification for the repetition of text and illustrations.

The article Architectura is another example of this advantageous combination of separate articles and illustrations, and here, too, the student is provided with a useful glossary of architectural terms. In like manner under Arms and Armour we find information which in Smith the student must search for under, Clippius, Parma, Pelta, Scutum, Ocrea, Lorica, Cingulum, Galea, Hasta, etc. This article, in the dis-

cussion of Homeric armor, shows a distinct improvement over Smith. Some of the illustrations are drawn from Reichel's *Ueber Homerische Waffen*, but the position of the writer is a conservative one and, after describing the Thorax, he refers expressly to Reichel only as follows: "The warriors sometimes fight without a θώρηξ, and Reichel considers that the μύτρη was the only defensive armor, besides the shield, used by the heroes."

In other cases, too, the editor silently corrects errors in the Smith. Thus where Smith under *Lectus*, Vol. II, p. 18, col. 2, says "Often the feet (fulcra) too were of gold or silver," citing *Verg. Aen.* VI, 603, Cornish substitutes a brief statement of the explanation offered by Anderson in the *Classical Review*, Vol. III, p. 373.

Mistakes seems to be rare, but on page 698 under *προβολή* it is said that "The six generals who were impeached after the battle of Arginusae, 406 B. C., were proceeded against by *προσβολή*" (Xen. Hell. I, F. 35). It was the accusers of the generals who were so proceeded against, as is stated by Smith, Vol. II, p. 4 g, 2 b.

F. H. HOWARD

COLGATE ACADEMY

An Outline of the History of Educational Theories in England. By H. T. MARK. C. W. Bardeen, Syracuse, N. Y., 1899. \$1.25.

WE are still waiting for a history of educational theories in England. Mr. A. F. Leach has done more than any other person in England to stir up interest in this subject, and his books on *The Schools at the Reformation* and *Winchester College* have shed new lights on the early centuries. This book is one of the results of this awakening, but its contents are revealed by its title, "An Outline." It seems to be written for text-book purposes, a fault too common with our works on education. It is useful, however, in suggesting what a splendid field for investigation is open to the student of the history of education.

GEORGE HERBERT LOCKE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES

ASSOCIATED ACADEMIC PRINCIPALS' CONFERENCE.—The associated academic principals of the State of New York will hold their Fifteenth Holiday Conference at Syracuse, N. Y., on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, Dec. 26-28, 1899. A program of great interest has been provided, the chief topics for discussion being language, history, mathematics, and science. The special committees having charge of the discussion of these several subjects have worked in considerable detail a method of procedure and have formulated well considered and sensible outlines for each meeting. So far as careful planning can insure the success of any conference, the Syracuse meeting raises high expectations. The principals themselves as they gather from all quarters of the Empire state will bring a stock of earnestness, good cheer, and enthusiasm that will make it good to be there. The president this year is Principal D. C. Farr, of Glens Falls, and the secretary, S. Dwight Arms, of the U. S. N. Y. The University Regents and the State Department of Public Instruction will as usual be represented at the meeting.

THE ILLINOIS STATE TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION AND COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.—The following circular has been issued, signed by the Executive Committees of the College Section and High School Section of the Illinois State Teachers' Association:

At a recent meeting of representatives of the High School and College sections of the State Teachers' Association it was decided to modify the conventional program of the Springfield meeting, so far as these two sections are concerned, in the hope of awaking a more active interest. Accordingly, the separate sectional meetings will be abandoned this year, save short business meetings, and two joint conferences of the High School and College sections will be held on Friday, December 29. The evening meeting on the same day has also been turned over to these two sections, and we expect to have an important address by a distinguished speaker. Attention is called to the fact that the special meetings of these two sections are compressed within one day.

The general subject of consideration at the conference will be the report of the Committee of Thirteen at Los Angeles upon "College Entrance Requirements," with the object of making as many of the recommendations of that committee as are approved effective in the institutions of the state. It is expected that one or two of the members of the committee will be present.

This is a matter of much importance to the unification of our educational systems; a full representation is desired from the High Schools, and we request each college in the state to

1. Consider formally the report of the Committee of Thirteen and to send to

Springfield at least one instructed delegate. No binding action can or will be taken, but it is hoped that definite action, in the shape of recommendations may be reached.

2. The colleges are also asked to consider the feasibility of a system of joint accrediting, according to which the certification of some examining board or joint committee may be accepted as satisfactory by all the colleges of the state. It is believed, if a good majority of the delegates are favorable to such action, that a satisfactory plan can be worked out.

A definite program will be sent out about November 20. We hope that the subjects here suggested will engage your immediate attention.

SCIENCE IN THE ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.—Professor Meldola, who is a member of the Essex Technical Education Committee, and is largely responsible for the success of the recent policy of that county in developing its secondary schools, takes up in the columns of the *Times*, the controversy initiated by Professor Armstrong and Sir W. Anson as to the "secondary" section of the education department. He approaches it from another point of view, however, and points out with absolute truth the danger to science of the predominance of purely literary men in high places in the government departments. It is notorious that none of the education department's officials or inspectors have any scientific training, and until Mr. Acland, in 1894, appointed his thirteen inspectors, even the science and art department considered it unnecessary for a man to know science in order to inspect a school devoted to that subject. Headmasters of great public schools, and, to an almost equal extent, the second grade headmasters, are men with degrees in classics or mathematics. This, of course, is largely due to the preference for clerics still shown in the highest quarters. The science teaching, as Professor Meldola shows, which has been "imposed from without" and by the city councils on the secondary schools in the last seven years, is very popular with the headmasters. Their reasons are twofold. In the first place, this "imposition" seems a vast endowment of a subject which they themselves do not know and cannot even supervise. Secondly, the science master is paid better than the other masters, and the county council often insists on his selection for intellectual rather than athletic qualifications. But we doubt if this is the real issue at headquarters, and we look further afield for the source of the agitation against Captain Abney.—*The Journal of Education (London)*. September 1899.

THE LATEST issue in the International Modern Language Series (Ginn & Co.) is an edition of selections from Mme. de Sévigne's Letters, edited by James A. Harrison. In these selections this brilliant letter writer is seen at her best, which is very good indeed, and the work, which could not be edited by more competent hands, forms an interesting introduction to the social and literary life of the age of Louis XIV.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

EDUCATION, PSYCHOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY

Exercises in Mind-Training. By Catharine Aiken. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. 122. Price \$1. Harper & Bros.

Syllabus of Psychology. By James H. Hyslop, Ph.D., Columbia University. Magazine size; pp. 116. The Macmillan Company.

History of Education. By Levi Seeley, Ph.D., New Jersey State Normal School. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. 343. American Book Company.

Syllabus of an Introduction to Philosophy. By Walter T. Marvin, Ph.D., Columbia University. Magazine size; pp. 152. The Macmillan Company.

Methods of Knowledge. An Essay in Epistemology. By Walter Smith, Ph.D., Lake Forest University. Size $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.; xxii + 340. The Macmillan Company.

Forty-Fifth Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of New York. Size $9 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. lxi + 1174. Albany: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford Co.

The Revelation of Jesus. A Study of the Primary Sources of Christianity. By George Holley Gilbert, Ph.D., D.D. Size $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. xi + 375. Price \$1.25. The Macmillan Company.

Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, being the Fiftieth Report upon the Public Schools of New Hampshire. Size 9×8 in.; pp. 383. Manchester, N. H.: Arthur E Clarke.

School Hygiene. By Ludwig Kotelnmann, Ph.D., M.D. Translation by John A. Bergstrom and Edward Conradi, Indiana University. Size 7×5 in.; pp. 391. Price \$1.50. Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen.

Institutes of Education; comprising an Introduction to Rational Psychology. By S. S. Laurie, M.A., LL.D., University of Edinburgh. Second Edition Revised and Extended. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. xiv + 442. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Old English Idylls. By John Leslie Hall, College of William and Mary. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. vii + 108. Price 45 cents. Boston: Ginn & Co.

Supplementary Exercises. To a company "Das Deutsche Buch." By Joseph Shrankamp. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. 119. Price 50 cents. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

A First Manual of Composition. By Edwin Herbert Lewis, Ph.D., Lewis Institute, Chicago. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. xxvi + 236. Price 60 cents. The Macmillan Company.

Tales from Shakespeare. By Charles and Mary Lamb. With twelve illustrations by A. Rackham. Size 6×4 in.; pp. viii + 362. Price 50 cents. The Macmillan Company.

Young April. By Egerton Castle, author of The Pride of Jennico, etc. With illustrations by A. B. Wenzell. Size 7×5 in.; pp. xv + 452. The Macmillan Company.

The Prince's Story Book. Edited with an Introduction by George Laurence Gomme. Illustrated by H. S. Banks. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. xxix + 392. Price \$2. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Pope. The Iliad of Homer—Books I, VI, XXII, and XXIV. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Philip Gentner, B.A., Indiana University. Size $6 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. lxxii + 180. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.

Evangeline. A Tale of Acadie. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Agnes Lathé, A.M. The Cambridge Literature Series. Size 6×5 in.; pp. xxxii + 142. Price 30 cents. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.

The Vision of Sir Launfal, and other Poems. By James Russell Lowell. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Ellen A. Vinton, M.A. The Cambridge Literature Series. Size 6×5 in.; pp. xxix + 63. Price 25 cents. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.

The Listening Child. A Selection from the Stories of English Verse, made for the Youngest Readers and Hearers. By Lucy W. Thacher. With an Introductory note by Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Size $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. xxix + 408. The Macmillan Company.

Representative Poems of Robert Burns, with Carlyle's Essay on Burns. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by Charles Lane Hanson, Instructor in English in the Mechanic Arts High School Boston. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. xii + 84. Price 45 cents. Ginn & Co.

GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Latin Composition. By Basil L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. 188. New York: University Publishing Company.

Cæsar for Beginners. A First Latin Book. By William T. St. Clair, A.M. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. xv + 357. Price \$1.20. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Orations of Cicero. With Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Robert W. Tunnall, Norfolk Academy. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. xxxiv + 585. New York: University Publishing Company.

Latin Literature of the Empire. Selected and edited by Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania. In two volumes; Volume II, Poetry. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. viii + 488. Price \$1.50. Harper & Bros.

Gildersleeves' Latin Grammar. Second edition. By Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, and Gonzalez Lodge, Bryn Mawr College. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. viii + 328. New York: University Publishing Co.

C. Juli Caesaris De Bello Gallico. Commentariorum Libri VII Cum libro VIII A. Hirtii. Edition Nouvelle. Par MM. Constans, Professeur a la Faculte des lettres d'Aix; and Denis, Professeur agreé au Lycée de Rouen. Size $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ in.; pp. 415, Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave,

MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

A Three-year Preparatory Course in French. By Charles F. Kroeh, A. M. Size $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ in.; pp. 388. Price \$1. The Macmillan Company.

French Reading for Beginners. With Notes and Vocabulary by Oscar Kuhns, Wesleyan University. Size $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. 310. Henry Holt & Co.

Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard, par Anatole France. With Introduction and Notes by C. H. C. Wright, Harvard University. Size $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. xviii + 279. Henry Holt & Co.

Der Katzensteg. By Roman von Hermann Sudermann. Abridged and edited by Benjamin W. Wells, Ph.D. (Harv.) Size $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ in.; pp. vi + 203. Price 40 cents. D. C. Heath & Co.

El Captain Veneno; por D. Pedro A. De Alarcon. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary by J. D. M. Ford, Harvard University. Size 6½ x 4½ in.; pp. v + 167. Price 65 cents. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.

Mein Leben. Von Johann Gottfried Seume. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by J. Henry Senger, Ph.D., University of California. Size 7½ x 5 in.; pp. vii + 136. Price 65 cents. Boston: Ginn & Co.

Letters of Madame de Sevigne. Selected, edited and annotated by James A. Harrison, LL.D., L.H.D., Professor of Teutonic Languages in the University of Virginia. Size 7½ x 5 in.; pp. v + 193. Price 75 cents. Ginn & Co.

Schiller's Maria Stuart; Ein Trauerspiel. With Introduction and Notes by Hermann Schoenfeld, Ph.D., Professor of German and of Continental History in the Columbian University, Washington, D. C. Size 7 x 5 in.; pp. lvii + 322. New York: The Macmillan Company.

HISTORY, POLITICS, ECONOMICS

Abraham Lincoln. The Man of the People. By Norman Hapgood. Size 8 x 5½ in.; pp. viii + 432. Price \$2. The Macmillan Company.

England in the Nineteenth Century. By C. W. Oman, Oxford. Size 7½ x 5¼ in.; pp. viii + 276. Price \$1.25. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Stories from Froissart. By Henry Newbolt, author of Admirals All, The Island Race, etc. Illustrated. Size 7½ x 5½ in.; pp. xxix + 368. Price, \$1.50. The Macmillan Company.

Syllabus of a Course of Eighty-seven Lectures on Modern European History (1600-1890). By H. Morse Stephens, Cornell University. Size 7½ x 6 in.; pp. xviii + 319. Price \$1.60. The Macmillan Company.

A History of England. For High Schools and Academies. By Katharine Coman, Ph.B., and Elizabeth Kimball Kendall, M.A., Wellesley College. Size 8¼ x 5¾; in.; pp. xxviii + 507. Price \$1.25. The Macmillan Company.

SCIENCE

About the Weather. By Mark W. Harrington. Size 7 x 5 in.; pp. xx + 246. D. Appleton & Co.

The Story of the Fishes. By James Newton Baskett, M.A., author of the Story of the Birds, etc. Size 7 x 5 in.; pp. xxii + 297. Price 75 cents. D. Appleton & Co.

The Insect World. A Reading Book of Entomology compiled and edited by Clarence Moores Weed, D.Sc. Size 7 x 5 in.; pp. xxi + 210 Price 60 cents. D. Appleton & Co.

